

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_92395
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of Injury Severity Score, Glasgow Coma Scale, and Revised Trauma Score in Predicting the Outcome in Young Patients with Trauma Attending Emergency Department of Suez Canal University Hospitals
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/editorial-policy>)

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)
<u>Compulsory REVISION</u> comments	<p>Overall, this is a clear, concise, and well-written manuscript. The introduction is relevant and theory based. Sufficient information about the previous study findings is presented for readers to follow the present study rationale and procedures. The methods are generally appropriate, although clarification of a few details and provision of a rationale for the use of this particular method should be provided.</p> <p>Overall, the results are clear and compelling with two possible exceptions. The authors make a systematic contribution to the research literature in this area of investigation. The longitudinal nature of the work is a welcome addition. Overall, this is a high quality manuscript that has implications for the theoretical basis. However, the relevance to nursing per is uncertain.</p> <p>The article title and abstract are appropriate.</p> <p>The purpose of the article and its significance is not stated clearly.</p> <p>The study methods are not sound and appropriate.</p> <p>The writing is clear and concise.</p> <p>The conclusions or summary are not accurate and supported by the content. The article is of interest to members of the education research community.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>It is very weak and insufficiently referenced, because there is no data or methodological quality to support it. It is compared to other studies, but what kind of design did they have?</p> <p>Conclusions</p> <p>There are statements that are not methodologically supported by the study. Qualitative data appear, without design or objective to support them</p> <p>References</p> <p>Check the references, they do not follow APA regulations, they are incomplete or wrong.</p>	
<u>Minor REVISION</u> comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Morteza Alibakhshkenari
Department, University & Country	Stirling University, UK