

Review Form 3

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

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This manuscript addresses a critical issue in Chest radiographs, offering valuable insights that could advance in theoretical understanding. 2. The statistical methods employed need further explanation. Clarifying the statistical significance of the results would strengthen the findings. 3. The literature review is insufficient and fails to engage with key studies in the field. This oversight undermines the paper's theoretical foundation 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract effectively outlines the main objectives of the study, providing readers with a clear understanding of the research focus right from the start. 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript does not offer significant new insights or advancements in the field. It largely reiterates existing knowledge without adding meaningful depth or originality. 2. Adding more visual representations of data (e.g., graphs, charts) could enhance understanding and engagement with the results. 3. The data presented appears to be outdated 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	J. Jegan
Department, University & Country	The Apollo University, India