

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_116625
Title of the Manuscript:	Social Factors Affecting Management of Patients with Traumatic Head Injury
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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, it brings up the current lack of facilities and infrastructure and how the demand is much higher than existing resources.</p> <p>Not accurate, better title would be – ‘Socioeconomic factors affecting delay in initial radiological assessment of Traumatic head injury’.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, the type of study fits more into a descriptive study, rather than a prospective one as mentioned in the manuscript</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>1. Word usage including is not appropriate as ‘CT scan’ does not encapsulate the entire management of Traumatic brain injury. Suggested to change to initial radiological evaluation / assessment of TBI.</p> <p>2. In materials and methods, the authors mentioned this is a prospective study. But there is no follow up duration. The study appears to be descriptive and observational in nature.</p> <p>3. In results, Why is time interval between occurrence of traumatic event and CT examination classified as ‘<4 hours, 5 hours to 6 days, 1 week to 1 month and >1 month’. Is there a prognostic value to such a classification? Justify.</p> <p>4. In results, Mode of injury was not described. It would be vital to understand if there is a correlation between mode of injury and time interval to initial CT scan.</p> <p>5. Clinical severity of TBI (based on initial GCS) was also not addressed. It would be imperative to understand if mild TBI patients had a longer interval to initial CT assessment as presentation might have been confusing.</p> <p>6. Figure 3 shows different causes of delay that includes a bar for ‘no delay’. Please modify.</p> <p>7. In results, It might be ideal to classify causes of delay into various categories such as ‘Patient related’ , ‘Hospital related’ , ‘logistical’ etc</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

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:	Ijaz N. Pillai
Department, University & Country	Rajiv Gandhi University, India