

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_123889
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Radiation Dose in Radiographic Procedures: Compliance with Brazilian and International Diagnostic Reference Levels (DRLs)
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -		

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	General Comments 1. The authors should review the English grammar. 2. There was some misunderstanding of the DRL concept, which was confounded with typical value doses. 3. The manuscript focuses on quality control, which is not the main objective of the work. 4. The authors should have included a sample of patients in the study, following ICRP 135's recommendation. 5. ICRP 135 highly recommends obtaining typical dose values for a sample of patients. In the case of radiography, at least 20 patients are required for each clinical indication, which was not considered in this work. 6. Image quality was also not mentioned. 7. The presentation of the methodology and results needs improvement. 8. RDC 330 does not indicate DRL. 9. Several technical problems were observed in the work. Therefore, it is not recommended for publication.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Simone Kodlulovich Renha
Department, University & Country	Instituto De Radioproteção e Dosimetria, Brazil