

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Blood Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IBRR_102192
Title of the Manuscript:	Penetrating stab wounds of the spine: Two cases and review of the literature
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.journalibr.com/index.php/IBRR/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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? This manuscript provides valuable insights into the management of penetrating stab wounds of the spine. As the incidence of such injuries is increasing due to the availability and accessibility of edged weapons, understanding their clinical presentation, surgical intervention, and outcomes is crucial. The two clinical cases presented in the manuscript, along with the literature review, contribute to the existing knowledge in the field. Therefore, this manuscript is important for the scientific community. 2. Is the title of the article suitable? The title "Penetrating stab wounds of the spine: Two cases and review of the literature" accurately reflects the content of the manuscript and provides a concise summary of the study. It is suitable and effectively conveys the focus of the article. 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? The abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the manuscript. It briefly summarizes the increasing incidence of penetrating spine wounds caused by edged weapons, presents the two clinical cases, and discusses the associated neurological deficits and surgical interventions. The abstract also mentions the rarity of certain lesions and emphasizes the importance of surgical management in specific cases. Overall, the abstract effectively captures the key points of the manuscript. 4. Are the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? The manuscript follows a logical structure with clear subsections, including an introduction, case presentation, discussions, and conclusion. The introduction provides background information on penetrating trauma, the prevalence of different weapons, and their regional variances. The case presentation section describes two clinical cases in detail, and the discussions section contextualizes the findings within the existing literature. The conclusion succinctly summarizes the key findings and highlights the controversial aspects of surgical intervention. The overall structure and subsections are appropriate and help the reader navigate through the manuscript. 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Based on the information presented in the manuscript, the findings appear to be scientifically correct. The clinical cases are described in detail, and relevant imaging studies are included to support the diagnoses. The discussion of the cases is grounded in the existing literature, and the conclusions drawn align with the presented evidence. However, without access to the complete methodology and data analysis, a comprehensive assessment of scientific accuracy is not possible. 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form. The manuscript includes several references that support the information provided. While the references seem to cover the relevant literature, it would be beneficial to include more recent studies, especially those published within the last five years. This would enhance the currency and comprehensiveness of the article. Additionally, the references could be formatted consistently according to a specific citation style. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communications. However, some sentences could be rephrased or edited for clarity and conciseness. It is recommended to proofread the manuscript carefully to correct any grammatical errors or awkward phrasings that might affect the reader's understanding. 	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	Additional Comment: It would be beneficial to include a section on the limitations of the study or case series, as this would provide transparency and help readers understand the potential biases or constraints in the presented cases. Additionally, further discussion on the long-term outcomes and functional recovery of the patients could add valuable insights to the manuscript.	
----------------------------------	--	--

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nitin N. Jagdhane
Department, University & Country	Dr D Y Patil Medical College, India