



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_34067
Title of the Manuscript:	THE USEFULNESS OF THE PLANAR PINHOLE 99MTECHNETIUM-SESTAMIBI PARATHYROID SCINTIGRAPHY IN PREOPERATIVE LOCALIZATION OF PARATHYROID ADENOMA IN PATIENTS WITH PRIMARY HYPERPARATHYROIDISM AT AN ACADEMIC HOSPITAL IN SOUTH AFRICA.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. I think the present study showed partly validity of MIRP using 99mTcscintigraphy. However, if authors hope to elucidate the complete usefulness of such procedure, authors have to compare diagnostic & surgical results between the patients treated under 99mTc scintigraphy and the patients without 99mTc scintigraphy. 2. The authors have used t-test for analysis of pre- and postoperative serum Calcium and PTH values. However, the sample sizes seems to be quite small, and also standard deviation, especially in preoperative PTH, was quite large. Therefore, I wonder whether parametric analysis such as t-test is appropriate in this study, or not. Authors should indicate these data being within Gauss distribution, if authors use parameter analysis tools.	1. The authors are only trying to point out how useful this nuclear medicine procedure could be in PHPT localisation. Further study to further validate the findings in this study could be done by comparing diagnostic and surgical outcome between the patients treated under 99mTc scintigraphy and the patients without 99mTc scintigraphy. 2. There is no minimum sample size for the t test to be valid. The two-sample t-test is valid if the two samples are independent simple random samples from Normal distributions with the same variance and each of the sample sizes is at least two (so that the population variance can be estimated.) Considerations of power are irrelevant to the question of the validity of the test. Depending upon the size of the effect that one wishes to detect, a small sample size may be imprudent, but a small sample size does not invalidate the test. Of course, larger sample sizes are always better because they provide more precise estimates of parameters. The Central Limit Theorem tells us that sample means are more Normally distributed than individual values, but as pointed out by Casella and Berger, it is of limited usefulness since the rate of approach to Normality must be checked for any particular case. Relying on rules of thumb may not be the best approach.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		