SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Applied Science & Technology**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	- Please consider revising the English grammar. - The principal aims of the study are: investigate the GD treatment with radioactive iodine (^{131}I-NaI) and correlate the clinical symptoms before and after the therapeutic procedure, evaluating the T3, T4 and TSH at the same time as well. Then organize the text with this focus.	
Minor REVISION comments	- Please define all terms (TFT, GIT, TSH, GD, etc) at the first time that they appear. - Line 33 to Line 39: Please extract these phrases from the text. They are not important here. - Line 40: Please extract from the text the term "Beside radioiodine" - Line 59: Please consider changing the word "samples" to "patients" - Line 64: Please consider ^{99m}Tc instead of Tc-99m. - Line 65: Please consider ^{123}I instead of Iodine 123. - Line 67: Please consider "the treatment ^{131}I activity was given". - Line 71: Please consider MBq instead of mCi. - Line 73: Here and in all the manuscript, please use the term "^{131}I" instead of "iodine 131".	

	- Line 74: Please consider “SPSS computational program”. - Line 79: Please consider: “From a total of 39 patients collected in KAU hospital,...”. - Line 79: Please rewrite this phrase. It is very confuse to read. - Line 83: Please consider “were ranged from 25 years to 35 years”. - Line 83: There is no space between 42.9 and %. Please exclude this space here and in the all manuscript. - Table 1: Please exclude the “N (%)” below the the word “Age” and “Gender”. - Figure 1: The title of the figure should be changed. Please consider the possibility of inserting a new one indicating “clinical findings indicating thyroid disorders”. - Line 124: Please give a scientific reference for these data. - Figure 2: Please consider in the figure “Before & after treatment”. - Please explicitly define “After 3 Months”, “After”. Maybe the correct term should be “< 3 months”, “3 months” and “> 3 months”. - Line 150: Please here and in the all manuscript use uppercase letter after Tables and Figures legends. - Table 5: Please explicitly define in the text the term TSH_B, TSH_A, T3_B, T3_A, etc. - Line 194: Please exclude this phrase from the text. - Line 204: The phrase “Then, the follicular...” should be transferred to Introduction Section. - Table 6 and Figure 3 should be transferred to Results Section.	

	- Line 117: Please consider "it was noted..." - Line 199: Please consider "before and after the treatment" - Line 220: Please exclude this phrase from the text. It is not important here. - Line 243: Please exclude the word "definitive" from the phrase. This word is very strong to put here. - Line 250 to 294: Please verify the correct form for indicating references.	
Optional/General comments	The subjects of this study are not new. It does not bring any new scientific information for radionuclide therapy or nuclear medicine area. Although the manuscript has been written in a reasonable English grammar, some parts of it are not very clear to read or understand. The sections of the manuscript were not well established once one can see on Discussion Section tables and results that should be transferred to Results Section. The International Unit System (SI) was not followed, and there are many phrases that should be extracted from the text. On considering the previous General Comments, the English grammar should be revised by a native English speaker and a large editorial revision and corrections need to be made in the present manuscript . **It has not been evidenced any ethical issues in this manuscript.**	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Anonymous**
Department, University & Country	***University of São Paulo, Brazil***