

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_114956
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of conventional radiography and multidetector computed tomography scan in knee trauma in Rajavithi 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript could be of importance if there was clinical correlation showing the effect of the greater accuracy when CT imaging is utilised. It's well accepted that CT is able to pick up fractures more accurately than X-ray alone but it would be of great interest to demonstrate the clinical utility of this fact – whether it leads to change in management or not. 2. The title is suitable. 3. The abstract is comprehensive. 4. The subsections and the structure are appropriate. 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct 6. The references are sufficient and recent with a good number taken from the last 5 years. 7. In the introduction try to summarise the reference findings in one sentence eg ...According to a study by Stiell IG et al.4, an investigation of acute knee injuries was conducted. In a retrospective review of 1,967 patients with knee injuries, knee radiography alone was found to have low sensitivity in detecting fractures, with only 5.2% of patients with confirmed fractures identified through conventional radiography. Instead – In a retrospective study, Stiell et al reviewed 1967 patients with knee injuries and knee radiography alone was found to have a low sensitivity in detecting fractures, with only 5.2% of patients with confirmed fractures identified through conventional radiography 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Language is suitable</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>May I suggest reviewing the cases where there were missed fractures and demonstrate the change in management by having the CT imaging. This would show the clinical importance of capturing the subtle injuries that would be missed by x-ray alone.</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:	Mordicai Atinga
Department, University & Country	Aga Khan University Hospital, Kenya