

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORR_127330
Title of the Manuscript:	A Prospective Inter-Observer Reliability Analysis of Plain X-ray, CT and MRI in Thoracolumbar Fractures and their role in decision making.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript idea is very good as it proves the already known need of CT scan and MRI in addition to plain Xrays in classification and decision making of surgery of thoraco-lumber fractures. It is a much-needed justification of the cost of adding these investigations as routine for decision making. It justifies the costs for insurance and policy makers of adding different investigation modalities.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is very suitable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	It is sufficient.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It adds nothing new to what we already know but it supports it. The idea is new, but the techniques are already in use for long time. It justifies the costs of investigations in front of policy makers and insurance firms.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are old mostly more than 20 years old. We usually need recent references to justify the need of the study. The most recent one is 10 years old. Reference number 9 has no date.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The results did not include the approach and surgeries selected based on the conclusions reached from the red ologies although it was mentioned prior, hence it was not included in the discussion. This was a major weakness as later it was excluded from the discussion although it would have been a point of strength to be added.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Khaled M F Saoud
Department, University & Country	Ain Shams University, Egypt