

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_124606
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Chest Radiograph Findings Among Patients in a Tertiary Hospital in Rivers State: A Comparative Two-Year Retrospective Study</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The importance of Chest Radiographs is undeniable in today's era where there is an increasing trend in the numbers of respiratory and cardiac pathologies. I appreciate the authors for this research as this may prove to be a significant step towards the introduction of chest x-ray as a routine screening method after well consideration of associated contributing factors to various common chest pathologies. Although, a risk of radiation, which might cause certain detrimental effects, is also a crucial point to consider before making any such approaches.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is fine but still I'd like to recommend the following one: -  A Retrospective Comparative Analysis of Chest Radiograph Findings Among Patients in a Tertiary Hospital in Rivers State.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The first header point under abstract should be Background and not Objective. Because, if it's objective, then the content inside doesn't justify the heading appropriately. Also, the word retrospective or any synonym should be used in the objective or purpose clearly as abstract is the first thing that anyone reads. Everything else seems fine in the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsection under abstract- Background instead of Objective as stated above. Also, either a subsection or even a proper statement of conclusion should be there in the manuscript. This can be included at the end of the results as well. Everything else seems appropriate. Please follow the word count too, if not done already.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Chest radiography is clearly a valuable asset in the current medical practice, since it aids in the diagnosis of a vast number of thoracic pathologies, and thus further helps in their appropriate management too. So, a research analysis of the Chest x-ray findings clearly holds appropriate significance. Even though the research study is commendable, there are a few other factors that could be included and hold great significance in chest pathologies, one of which is the presence or absence of smoking.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The references are sufficient enough.	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Mostly, it is well written except a few minor errors which I'll be stating below (in bold): -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. An investigation carried out in the northwestern region of Nigeria documented an elevated incidence of thoracic lesions in males[5]. <b>(A full stop at the end of the above sentence was missed in the Introduction paragraph).</b></li> <li>2. The discrepancies highlight the necessity for research, that is specific to each region, <b>thus</b> customising <b>the</b> clinical practices to address the health needs of local populations.</li> <li>3. The content of the results outside the tables needs a thorough re-evaluation in terms of language. The tables are good and clear enough to understand but the content written below them seems to make the understanding a bit difficult as the language is somewhat inappropriate. <b>I'm writing down one below, please make changes in the other para accordingly: -</b></li> </ol> <p><b>Table 1 indicates that the 30-39 age category has the highest frequency, accounting for 1332 radiographs (21.49%). The 40-49 age group follows with 1106 radiographs (17.84%), while those over 60 years make up 1046 of them (16.88%). The 20-29 age group has 901 radiographs (14.54%). The lowest representation is in the age group of one year or younger, with 260 radiographs (4.19%). Additionally, more patients underwent chest radiographs in 2020, and there was a higher overall frequency of the same among females.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. It may indicate in this setting, cardiovascular diseases, such as hypertension and heart failure which <b>are quite</b> prevalent in the study population.</li> <li>5. Further investigations should strive to build upon these discoveries by conducting prospective, multi-center studies to authenticate results and offer a more comprehensive <b>evaluation</b> of the epidemiological patterns.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>There should be a mention about <b>radiation exposure</b> evaluation in the <b>limitations of the study</b>, since it is a very crucial factor for the inclusion of radiograph in the routine screening, which is the author's strong recommendation.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Ankit Aneja</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Pt. B. D. Sharma University of Health Sciences, India</b></p>