

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJMAH_117815
Title of the Manuscript:	PSYCHOLOGICAL IMPACT OF SPORTS INJURIES AMONG GHANAIAN UNIVERSITY ATHLETES
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.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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>	<p>Mental well-being and physical harm are intimately related. Having a chronic sickness or a major injury might lead to mental health issues. So the study is highly relevant</p> <p>Can be change such as The psychological impact of sports injuries among Ghanaian university athletes. OR The psychological effects of sports-related injuries on athletes at Ghanaian universities</p> <p>The abstract should be exact, straightforward, and highly particular; here, detailed findings can be disregarded, and the presentation of the abstract is sound.</p> <p>Appropriate Yes Sufficient</p> <p>The literature review is rather brief, and it should be supplemented with more sophisticated knowledge. The research gap of the work should be highlighted.</p> <p>The study objectives should be concise and listed as a distinct subheading under the head introduction. Surprisingly, the objectives are not mentioned in the article; this should be highlighted and presented before the methodological component of the investigation.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes/ moderate level</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In the discussion section, the results/observations must be communicated, investigated, explained, elaborated, and critically assessed in light of current studies on the subject. This issue in the article can be improved.</p> <p>The study's introduction is an first-rate way to illustrate the study's significance. Nonetheless, the study protocol must be strengthened in light of the present academic and research needs. The review is insufficient to emphasise the study's theme features; more article review and analysis are required. A conceptual/theoretical framework for the investigation can be presented here. The presentation needs to be improved as a first class article format, not an essay or dissertation format.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Rajeev M M
Department, University & Country	Central University of Rajasthan, India