

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_107867
Title of the Manuscript:	Risk Factors Predicting Prognosis in Moderate and Severe Traumatic Brain Injury in Pediatrics in Tanta University Hospital
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Please, read de optional/general comments</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes, it's correct.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Very interesting topic for potential readers of the magazine. However, some comments are made in order to improve the current version of the manuscript.</p> <p>.- Title. Perhaps the end of the title could be "in admitted pediatric patients"</p> <p>.- Abstract. Instead of "predominant cause," perhaps "most common cause" The acronym "TBI" is repeated up to 4 times and "GCS" three times. Review. "unfavorable" and "favorable" are repeated twice in close succession for each term. Specify meaning of "WCS".</p> <p>Methodology. Specify the recruitment time.</p> <p>Results. Very similar to the conclusions. Review. If it were possible to describe the sample succinctly. X women, Y men. Middle Ages. How many with moderate TBI and how many with severe. Mean GCS values or radiological findings.</p> <p>Conclusions. When you say "Low initial GCS score", you could specify some score, for example less than 9 points.</p> <p>.- Keywords. The terms "result, severe and moderate" consider eliminating. "GCS", better "Glasgow Coma Scale".</p> <p>.- Introduction. Could you indicate any number of cases of traumatic brain injury in children in the world or country where the study is carried out per year?</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>.- Methodology. Tanta University Emergency Hospital. Where are you? in Egypt? Is it a tertiary hospital? What pediatric population do you serve? Number of beds and income per year? Specify. Specify.</p> <p>Was the medical and surgical history of the patients recognized?</p> <p>“pneumocephalus”, better “pneumocephalus”</p> <p>When it says “surgical interventions, such as conservative treatments and decompressive evacuation or craniotomy, such as dehydration measures” Justify, it is not understood that surgical treatment is a conservative measure, but rather therapeutic (and invasive) and what dehydration measures mean?</p> <p>Statistic analysis. When it says “Statistical Program for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 24”. Maybe change to “IBM SPSS Statistics 24 statistical package”</p> <p>“It is calculated by dividing the sum of all the values in the set by the total number of values”, could be eliminated. It is considered known among the readers.</p> <p>.- Results. “average age”, correct to “average age”.</p> <p>Check “spacing” on all pages in this section.</p> <p>“exhibited hypotension”, could any additional information be specified? Idem, “seizures” and “pupil size”.</p> <p>“Six patients”, better “six patients”.</p> <p>“oxygen minimum sat forty%”, better “oxygen minimum saturation was forty%”</p> <p>“Hypoxia in TBI patients caused by either: declined GCS less than eight with subsequently elevated aspiration risk and airway protection lack. Respiratory center depression is occurred because of brain injury. Endotracheal intubation (ETT) was performed in eighty nine patients. ETT in TBI is not only serve as the airway protection but avoids hypercapnia and hypoxia.” Maybe better to use “;” between phrases that “.”</p> <p>“This can be explained by acute rise in level of cortisol and serum catecholamines early in trauma.” Better to include these interesting comments in the discussion section.</p> <p>Page 9, “(p-value more than 0.05)” could be removed. “important correlation” and “in all studied patients” are repeated twice. Review. Next paragraph “important” is repeated twice (on the second occasion there is a typographical error, double final t when it should be one). Consider eliminating “highly” and “important” (since the significant p gives away these adjectives).</p> <p>.- Discussion. One or two introductory sentences to the topic of the work are missing.</p> <p>Page 16, “in all studied patients” could be deleted. On the same page “in our investigation” (twice), consider similar expression. It is already used on the previous page. “hypo tension”, better “hypotension” “(sixteen patients)” it is not necessary to specify specific data on the results obtained, as is the case. Delete “important”</p> <p>Page 17, “moderate and severe TBI”, better “moderate and severe TBI” “our research” is repeated three times</p>	
--	--	--

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Page 19, why are these recommendations given, are they an objective of this work? Why follow the ATLS protocol and not another? Ask the previous question again. Specify the acronym "ATLS" (Advanced Trauma Life Support?)</p> <p>In this section, discussion as such is missing. Results are described and compared with those obtained in other studies, but why the agreements or disagreements with other works? Why some of the results obtained?</p> <p>.- Conclusions. They are brief. Review.</p> <p>.- References. Of the 22 citations provided, only 7 (32%) are recent (that is, five years or less since their publication). Consider including any additional recent references.</p> <p>"Signs and Symptoms", better "Signs and symptoms"</p> <p>Table 2. Idem. Signs and symptoms are best expressed in the form of numerical values. Add meaning of acronyms in text at the bottom of the table.</p> <p>Table 3. "P-value", better "p-value" "average±SD", better "mean±SD" "SD±", maybe better "±SD" "0.001<", better "<0.001"</p> <p>Columns in the "signs and symptoms" section lend themselves to confusion regarding favorable and unfavorable findings. Review.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	M. Belen Alonso-Ortiz
Department, University & Country	University of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Spain