

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_103384
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study of Patients with Blunt Trauma Chest, its Management and Outcome
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:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>It may be of some importance to the local community where the study was done.</p> <p>NO, it should reflect the study design. Add to the title: Descriptive study.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>I have several comments and suggestions to the authors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- This is not an interventional study, it is descriptive. 2- In the abstract: You can't make this conclusion [Early presentation within the golden period prevents complications and reduces mortality rates] because your study didn't address timing of hospital presentation and its effect on outcome. The conclusion should be derived from the results. 3- The introduction lacks references. For every idea presented in the introduction, a reference number or more should appear to cite the idea. 4- The total number of cases shouldn't appear in the method section. 5- The ABCD protocol that you mentioned in the method should be either referenced, or mention that it is the protocol used locally in your institute. 6- Common steps of thoracotomy: Too much details are provided that are un-related to the article. This article is not about (performing thoracotomy). 7- Please verify that you own copyrights to the figures included in the article. 8- Results: Please start by indicating how many cases were screened, how many were excluded, so that 64 were included. 9- Ideally, demographics follows. 10- There are 9 tables in the article, each one contains few variables. I suggest to combine tables 1 and 2 as demographics and mechanism of trauma, combine 3-5 as clinical presentation, 6 and 7 as management, and 8 and 9 as outcome. Here is a suggestion for combining tables 1 and 2: <table border="1" data-bbox="1050 1459 2122 1890"> <thead> <tr> <th>Variable:</th> <th colspan="2">N (%) or Mean ± SD</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Sex:</td> <td>Male</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Female</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Age (years)</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="7">Age Groups:</td> <td>0-10</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>11-20</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>21-30</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>31-40</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>41-50</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>51-60</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>61-70</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Variable:	N (%) or Mean ± SD		Sex:	Male		Female		Age (years)			Age Groups:	0-10		11-20		21-30		31-40		41-50		51-60		61-70		
Variable:	N (%) or Mean ± SD																											
Sex:	Male																											
	Female																											
Age (years)																												
Age Groups:	0-10																											
	11-20																											
	21-30																											
	31-40																											
	41-50																											
	51-60																											
	61-70																											

Review Form 1.7

	<p style="text-align: center;">More than 70</p> <hr/> <p>Mode of Trauma: Vehicle Accident Fall from height Assault with blunt object Fall of heavy object Assault with fist and blows and kicks Others (animal injury)</p> <hr/> <p>11- For mean age, please add standard deviation. 12- In order to appreciate the severity of trauma, Can you please add in the clinical presentation any measure of severity (Injury Severity Score (ISS), New Injury Severity Score (NISS), Revised Trauma Score (RTS) and Trauma and Injury Severity Score (TRISS) or any other that is locally used in your institute? 13- When writing the age categories 11-20 and 31-40 you missed a dash, so they appeared: 1120 and 3140 14- Discussion: This is probably the weakest part of the article, I many concerns: a- Please don't repeat the numerical results in the discussion. You mention the main results in general. b- What do you mean exactly by (comparable) and (near comparable)? Exactly how do you define each term? c- The discussion of an article is much more than just repeating the results, and citing studies of similar ones. In the discussion you should try to explain your results. Why do you think you got those results? For example: Why trauma was more common in a specific age group? In a certain sex, why a certain mechanism of injury is more common? And so on, studies that have similar results are used to support your argument. Then, the discussion should include a section about the importance of the article, why a reader should read it? How will it benefit? What are its implications on further studies and / or policy makers, the discussion should also include (Limitations) section, in your study there are several, such as the small sample size, the sample is not representative of trauma patients (evident by apparent low severity), observational nature, and lack of comparison between management modalities.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No, the article needs proofreading to correct numerous grammar errors.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It needs major and extensive revision.</p>	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Waleed Tharwat Aletreby
Department, University & Country	Saudi Arabia