



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |                                                                     |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">British Journal of Applied Science &amp; Technology</a> |
| Manuscript Number:       | 2014_BJAST_15437                                                    |
| Title of the Manuscript: | THE ROLE OF RADIOACTIVE IODINE IN THYROTOXICOSIS PATIENTS           |
| 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) |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments | <p><b>ABSTRACT:</b> This lacks clarity, shows no connection between the study aim and the conclusion.</p> <p><b>INTRODUCTION:</b> The subject was not clearly introduced. This section is full of redundant statements and grammatical errors that leave the reader confused. What is TSH serum? What is static's work?</p> <p><b>MATERIALS AND METHODS:</b> it is not clear how patients were selected, kind of data collected and whether or not permission was obtained from the ethical committee or the review board.</p> <p>Specific investigations leading to the diagnosis were not stated.</p> <p>What images is author referring to? Some results and discussion was mentioned in this section, why?</p> <p>How does SPSS investigate the role of radioactive iodine?</p> <p><b>RESULTS:</b> This is completely mixed up. The number of patients included in the report differs from the number analysed and this varies with the numbers presented in the tables and figures. Some of the results appeared in the discussion section. Figures and tables are poorly presented with unclear titles</p> <p><b>DISCUSSION:</b> this is very vague and contains some of the results as well as redundant statements and sentences from some of the references in a mere 'cut and paste' fashion.</p> |                                                                                                                                                                               |



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                                         |                                                                                                                                                                   |  |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
|                                         | <p><b>CONCLUSION:</b> there was no clear demonstration of how the conclusion was arrived at from the results presented.</p> <p><b>Yes. As mentioned above</b></p> |  |
| <b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments   |                                                                                                                                                                   |  |
| <b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments |                                                                                                                                                                   |  |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |                                              |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| Name:                            | <b>Anonymous</b>                             |
| Department, University & Country | <b>University of Cape Town, South Africa</b> |