

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_104721
Title of the Manuscript:	Recovery profile of patients suffered with Traumatic Brains Injuries (TBI): analysis of case reports
Type of the Article	Review 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The topic is interesting which tends to explain more about the TBI case reports.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Methodology of the abstract is not complete.</p> <p>No. Results and discussion must be separated.</p> <p>Not completely.</p> <p>For a review like this study, only 14 references are not acceptable.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The topic is interesting in which the authors tried to analyse the TBI recovery specifically in case reports. There are some issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- In my opinion, your keywords do not cover all articles you decided to evaluate. For example, outcome, improvement, etc. should be considered. What about the 'OR'? 2- Why do you select past five years only? It is better to extend your time interval. 3- Result section must be separated from the discussion. 4- Table of the study is not informative. There are so many data in it that some of them are not necessary. Please make it concise by separating the age, gender, complaint, deficits, recovery, treatment, outcome, time of follow-up, etc. 5- Discussion part has been written superficially. You must write it in depth and discuss about the mechanism or other important issues. 6- Your conclusion does not extract from your results! What you have written in conclusion, is some general information! 	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ahmad Pour-Rashidi
Department, University & Country	Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Iran