

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_32491
Title of the Manuscript:	Physician Knowledge of Radiation Risk in prescribing CT Imaging in Moroccan Hospitals.
Type of the Article	Review paper

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>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<u>Material and methods:</u> 1. Mention the study design (ex. cross sectional)? 2. How to standardize the questionnaire? 3. Statistical section is inadequate: ☐ There is no sample size (Convenient sample?) ☐ What about missing data (response rate 59%)? ☐ What are inclusion/exclusion criteria? ☐ Data analysis was performed using which software? In conclusion, I am worried that biased results are presented. Please clarify the ethical issue if any.	1. A descriptive exploratory study. 2. The questionnaire designed for this study took into account the different parameters on the knowledge levels of the scanners' preceptors concerning the effect of ionizing radiation. It is similar to that presented in other studies. 3. ☐ 1- During this study, we took a random sample for each hospitals ☐ We retrieved 159 completed questionnaires out of 260 distributed at the six hospitals, with a response rate of 59%. ☐ The criterion of inclusion of this study is that the doctor responding to our questionnaire must be a prescriber of the CT Scan examinations. ☐ Data analysis was performed using Microsoft Excel software. This work was carried out on the basis of an anonymous questionnaire with full respect for the confidentiality of participants and professional ethics.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<u>Editing and punctuation</u> The English and punctuation need to be corrected throughout the text Ex: from line 42 to 46 one sentence Line 81: 14 sections (4 sections) Line 90: Abbreviation ???? Line 105: capital letter (concerning)	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<u>Results</u> 2nd paragraph, line 104 to 110 need reformulation Results is preferred to be presented in tables or graphs In tables, write total not Σ	