Paper: **"Epidemiology of Injuries in the Radiology Department of a Teaching Hospital"**

Corresponding Author: Joseph Eze

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Dr. Evelio Velis

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Amina Wafik

Dr. Evelio Velis

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.
Completed: 2022-08-04 12:47 PM
Recommendation: Revisions Required

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ`s website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

* See my comments below.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

* See my comments below.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.
There are few errors. See my comments below and in the attached document.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

* The authors should report the limitation of the study.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

* See my comments below.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

* See my comments below.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ◉ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ◉ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ⦿ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ⦿ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ⦿ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ⦿ 3
- ○ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ● 4
- ○ 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- ○ Accepted, no revision needed
- ● Accepted, minor revision needed
- ○ Return for major revision and resubmission
- ○ Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Review and correct some spelling errors.

Tables should be constructed following the APA format.

References regarding research methods should be included.

The limitations of the study should be reported.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:
Reviewer Files

Shilan Hussein Karim

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.
Completed: 2022-08-26 07:37 PM
Recommendation: Accept Submission

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ`s website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- ○ Yes
- ● No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- ● Yes
- ○ No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- ● Yes
- ○ No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ● 3
- ○ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ● 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ● 3
- ○ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ● 3
- ○ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ● 3
- ○ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ● 2
- ○ 3
- ○ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ◉ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ○ 4
- ○ 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- ○ Accepted, no revision needed
- ◉ Accepted, minor revision needed
- ○ Return for major revision and resubmission
- ○ Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:
Reviewer Files