



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	Original 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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In abstract, mentioned 83 men, 102 male - is there any difference in gender wise? men also meant as males only 2. September and March 2017 – make to clear view of data collection period , 3. In study , mentioned as January to December – controversial in abstract 4. Retrospective quantitative human study design-make very clear about Study design 5. stratified randomly sampling technique – include the flow chart for selection of samples in methodology 6. In Analysis and discussion , the collected data of a total of 185 patients continuously repeating - no need to give the same information and avoid grammatical errors 7. 73.5% of the patients had negative radiological findings, while 26.5% had positive radiological findings – in what basis determined the positive and negative findings ?. 8. The majority of patients were females, comprising 55.1% of the total sample size, while 44.9% were male patients- its totally controversy of your previous statement 83 men, 102 male 9. In analysis, mentioned as Appropriate statistical tests were used based on the types of variables and the data - Only number &percentage was used , nowhere in tables used inferential statistics ? 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In introduction – mentioned Also, you discuss the issue of 21 replacing X-rays with other technique to avoid the possibility of damage caused by X-rays.[1-22 2] – who discussed here? 2. One study showed that chest X-38 rays did not affect the decision of radiologists to refer patients for surgery? – can mention with author name /place ? 3. EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS – why need to mention, Since it's a descriptive study? 4. In Keywords: Electromagnetic Waves; Chest X-ray; Radiological Finding; Medical Chart Review- mention only from the study title and sometimes in abstract 	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can revise the full article again as per author guidelines? 2. In the data analysis and discussion, Start to discuss based on objectives; so that it makes to be clear in study outcomes as well significance of the study can be highlighted. 3. Can include little more latest significance reviews ? 4. Give recommendation for the future researchers/followers? <p>- Make still more clear in the design, methodology and discussion part in this study.</p> <p>- Can include the latest research articles increase the significance of the study</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Rajathi Sakthivel</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>The Tamil Nadu Dr. M.G.R. Medical University, India.</i>