



ISSN NO. 2320-5407

ISSN: 2320-5407

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR- 50323

Date: 17/02/2025

Title: "Investigating the Comparison between MDCT Brain Plain and MRI Findings in Infants Presenting with Hydrocephalus: A Hospital-based Cross-Sectional Study"

Recommendation:

- ✓ Accept as it is
- Accept after minor revision.....
- Accept after major revision
- Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity	✓			
Significance	✓			

Reviewer Name: Dr. S. K. Nath

Date: 18/02/2025

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

Strong methodological approach, relevant clinical insights, and well-organized statistical analysis. Needs improvements in sample size, follow-up data, radiation risk discussion, and accessibility analysis.

Reviewer's Comment / Report

Strengths of the Paper:

- Clinical Relevance:** The study addresses an important medical concern: diagnosing hydrocephalus in infants using MDCT and MRI. It highlights comparative strengths of both imaging modalities, aiding in clinical decision-making.
- Well-Defined Methodology:** The study follows a cross-sectional comparative design, which is appropriate for assessing imaging differences. Ethical approval and informed consent were obtained, ensuring research integrity.
- Data-Driven Analysis:** The use of Chi-square tests for statistical significance strengthens the study's reliability. Data are presented systematically in tables, making it easy to interpret and compare results.
- Key Findings and Clinical Implications:** CT was better at detecting lateral ventricle involvement (94.9%). MRI was more successful in detecting 4th ventricle anomalies (30.8%) and spina bifida (5.1%). The study highlights that both modalities have complementary roles, reinforcing the need for a multidisciplinary approach.

Areas for Improvement:

- Small Sample Size:** Only 39 infants were included, which limits generalizability. Suggestion: Future studies should use larger cohorts and multicenter data to strengthen findings.
- Lack of Long-Term Follow-Up:** The study does not evaluate patient outcomes after imaging. Suggestion: Follow-up studies could assess how imaging influences treatment and prognosis.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

3. **Limited Discussion on Radiation Exposure:** While MDCT is known for higher radiation exposure, the study does not discuss its risks. Suggestion: A risk-benefit analysis of MDCT vs. MRI in infants would improve the paper.

4. **Absence of Cost and Accessibility Analysis:** MRI is often more expensive and less accessible than CT, which impacts clinical use. Suggestion: A discussion on cost-effectiveness and hospital resource availability would enhance the study's practicality.