



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_24487
Title of the Manuscript:	Histopathologic pattern of thyroid diseases in Abuja, Nigeria capital city: a review of one hundred and one consecutive cases.
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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. The article is within the scope of the journal. 2. It is an original work. 3. "The abstract" is insufficient. It is like the part of "material and methods", so it should be re-written and re-structured. 4. The part of "the abbreviations " is absent. 5. "The keywords" should be coherent with meSH, NLM data. 6. "The keywords" should not be integrally in forms of capital letter. 7. Do you mind to use or is it required to perform any statistical method(s) here to compare the systems/techniques/findings for the mentioned purposes emphasized in the manuscript ? 8. Some current "references" may be included in the list. 9. There are lots of deficiency in terms of usage of "the" article before the requiring words throughout the text. 10. The manuscript is seen as written a bit	The abstract has been modified and other correction done.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	imprecisely. There is no even number of page in the text. 11. There are lots of orthographical and grammatical errors throughout the text as: 12. Line 27, ..responsive organ.. 13. Line 29, ..responds to stimuli.. 14. Line 43, no need for the date of becoming capital city 15. Line 46-49, the sentence should be re-written 16. Line 56, ..all the biopsies.. 17. Line 59, ..in the archives of department.., ..all the sections.. 18. Line 60, ..by the pathologists.. 19. Line 60-61, the sentence should be re-written. 20. Line 63, ..all the lesions.. 21. Line 70, ..during the period.. 22. Line 71, ..specimen were.. 23. Line 72, delete “were” and “patents (?)” 24. Line 74, ..had represented.. 25. Line 77-78, delete “of cases”, ..these had been..	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	26. Line 80-82, the sentence should be re-written. 27. Line 82-83, ..adenomas had been..., ..ranges of 30-39.. 28. Line 84-85, ..twenty five percent of the cases of adenoma had been seen in male, 75 % in female, given a male.. 29. Line 86, ..had been seen.. 30. Line 8-89, ..all the thyroiditis were lymphocytic thyroiditis.. 31. Use abbreviation (i.e. NCG) throughout the text after first usage. 32. Line 96-100, the sentence should be re-written. 33. Line 101, ..commonest.. 34. Line 103, ..factor(s)..., ..intake.. 35. Line 105, ...which is proportional.. 36. Line 106-108, the sentence should be re-written. 37. Line 111, what kinds of defects ? 38. Line 118-127, the sentence should be re-written. 39. Line 131, ..incidence of sex and..	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	40. Line 133-137, the sentence should be re-written. 41. Line 137, ..was.. 42. Line 140, ...et al in Nigeria also.. 43. Line 142-148, the sentences should be re-written. 44. Line 154, ..there is.. 45. Line 156-169, the sentences should be re-written. 46. The "Conclusion" statement is insufficient, and it must be re-written and re-structured. 47. Table 1, line 214, ..the histopathological...after thyroidectomy. 48. Table 2&3 may/should be integrated. 49. No need for Table 4, line 227-229.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It is an original work.	