



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_44936
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of clinical outcomes of outpatients following chest X-ray imaging performed at King Abdul–Aziz Medical City, Saudi Arabia, Riyadh
Type of the 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>ABSTRACT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Background: research context + aim;- Materials & methods: to clearly define the gender composition (males & females) of the study <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Reference numbers should always be followed by full stop (.) and not the reverse; this is also observed in other sections of manuscript.- The research question is not clearly outlined; it is unclear why the current work should be carried out. I think authors need to do more literature search on the subject matter and try to put the study into context- There should be a clear statement of the aim. <p>MATERIALS & METHODS</p> <p>Text should be organized into sections such as study design, sample size determination, statistical analysis, etc.</p> <p>RESULTS</p> <p>Result comments should be followed by their respective tables</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Line 90: pleural effusion <p>DISCUSSION</p> <p>Line 126: to harmonize the reference with others</p> <p>Manuscript should be revised by a language expert for a better flow of information.</p> <p>Table 1: the y's beside the various age groups should be removed</p>	<p>We already defines the gender composition well</p> <p>modifications were done accordingly as per your comments</p> <p>We changed the order of the context; study design. sample size and statistical analysis</p> <p>Proof -reading was done by an expert</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

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>	