



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_53243
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Radiation Dose in Nuclear Medicine Controlled Areas: Hot Lab, Injection and Isolated Rooms
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 'MATERIALS AND METHOD: The first two paragraphs should go to the section on "STUDY AREA. 2. The methodology was not explained. The author has to fully describe the method of data collection (how the meters were used to obtain measurements) ie which specific detector was used to obtain specific measurement and how, before going to the computations. The author also should state how data were analyzed and results were presented. 3. In the cases where three measurement were made and the average computed-as in tables 5-7, this has to be stated in the method. <p>RESULTS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Title Results, should be put before table 1. 2 The title of table one should read "Contamination levels in the controlled areas. 3 The fig 0.059 should be better written as 0.060 because the actual value is 0.05997-for radiation protection dose estimate, it is safer when dose is over estimated. 4 Table 2 is ok 5 In table 3, the inclusion of information about injection room and isolated room is confusing because these are areas are different from the hot lab areas. So the author has to explain the reason or remove the information on those areas. The same applies to the inclusion of dose information on hot lab and isolated room while recording dose rate for the injection room in Table 4. 6 In Tables 5-7, the overall/total mean for each table has to be calculated and the background dose subtracted to give the actual dose contributed by the imaging process. <p>DISCUSSION</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The discussion was poor. In fact there was no discussion of findings. The author merely repeated the result. A good discussion should state: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The major results without making reference to the tables • How they agree or disagree with the work of other researchers in literature and then • The implication(s) of the findings. 2. In Line 12, the author made a statement on expressing the dose rate in terms of effective dose, it will be nice for the author can explain this further since he/she did not mention effective dose in the method nor say anything about tissue weighting factor which is important in obtaining effective dose. <p>REFERENCES</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ref 4. ARPNSA is the author 2. Ref 6. Add the year before the page and write page as: pp 48-55. 3. Ref 9. MOH, New Zealand is the author. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>. 1. ABSTRACT/ Conclusion- L1 " a wide range of----to be replaced with " excellent. The same applies to the other place – in Line 7 of the last paragraph of the discussion. I suggest that the last 4 lines of this paragraph has the sub-title: conclusion</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hyacienth Uche Chiegwu
Department, University & Country	Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Nigeria