



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJTDH_6677
Title of the Manuscript:	288 PIONNER COMPUTED TOMOGRAPHIC EXAMINATIONS IN UNIVERSITY OF UYO TEACHING HOSPITAL, UYO, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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>
	Introductory paragraphs lack coherence. Is ultrasonography a cross-sectional modality. Confusing expressions like "such technology has led to new frontiers of disease evaluations hitherto were non-existent" should be checked. Aims: should be integrated into the body of the text. Methods: expressions like et cetra et cetra are unnecessary. Results/discussions: Opening remarks are irrelevant to the aims of the study. Expressions like "Imagine in that short period of time..." are un scientific and should be reworded or expunged. The authors failed to give major CT findings, yet such findings were being discussed. This is an important aspect of this study especially as CT is being introduced for the first time. A tabular display of major findings in any part of the body will make this study more useful. I suggest the authors read an article by Erundu et al; Am.J.Sci.Ind.Res, 2011,2(4):482-487 Is it possible to get the specialty of referring doctors as this would be of public health importance. Authors set out to identify number of true positives? Was this achieved? What is the degree of correlation between the clinical (provisional) diagnosis and CT findings? This would be useful	Corrected Done Expunged Opening remarks in discussion is a proof that this is a pioneer study in UUTH. Besides this study was only made possible because UUTH management acquired CT Major CT finding analysis is outside the scope of study. Please see methodology and aims. Tabular display of chest CT done was chosen as an example and now inserted. Specialties of referring doctors have been mentioned in the results. Correlation of clinical and CT findings is our future research



SDI Review Form 1.6

	to build confidence among referring physicians who have limited experience with CT> References: More recent publications are needed to beef up this study. Authors to cross-check references according to journal specifications.	More recent references added. Journal specifics on referencing done
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This is an interesting study but requires major revision.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Accept if revision and corrections are made.	