



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMMR_22292
Title of the Manuscript:	Outcome of surgically treated traumatic extradural hematoma
Type of the 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>In this study, the authors examined the relationship between outcome and level of consciousness prior to a surgery for traumatic extradural hematoma in traumatic brain injured patients.</p> <p>The aim of this study is clinically relevant to the management of TBI patients. However, I have several major concerns regarding this paper. Firstly, the authors should include specific objectives, formulate hypotheses and use appropriate statistical analyses to demonstrate their points. The interpretation of the main findings is unclear because of a lack of cohesion between the objectives and analysis. A major revision and reorganization of the content is suggested for better clarification of goals, hypotheses and results. The text is difficult to read, as it lacks fluidity. A revision of English usage may increase the text quality. Another concern is that the novelty of this study is not well</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>demonstrated. The authors need to elaborate on how their paper provides an original contribution to the field. I strongly recommend that the author search for the support of a statistician as well as a medical researcher.</p> <p>Abstract</p> <p>The rationale and objective of the study should be clearly stated. The authors should specify which variables were measured. The results section in the abstract is not adequately presented. The statistics are not presented in a conventional manner. Finally, the conclusions are not related to the results that were presented earlier.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>The background needs to be expanded, and certain parts of the introduction are not pertinent, as they are unrelated to the objectives. Previous TBI outcome studies should be added. There is a wealth of literature on variables affecting outcome following TBI, such as age, GCS score, medical variables, surgical intervention, and type of TBI. The literature should be better integrated, and the authors should present a clear rationale for</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>their study. Adding more novel studies related to the objective is also of interest. A clear link should be made between the background information and objectives. Objectives should be better stated and the study requires a specific hypothesis. How is this study novel, and how does it contribute to the current literature?</p> <p>Material and methods</p> <p>The description of the procedure is incomplete, confusing and the methodology is unclear. This study seems to be a retrospective study rather than a prospective one. A well-integrated, clear description of the procedure and methods is necessary. The recruitment procedures should be better detailed, as well as criteria for inclusion and exclusion. For example, what type of brain surgery had patients undergone? How many patients were excluded? Certain parts of the procedure are difficult to follow and some of the patients' medical information was unrelated to the objectives.</p> <p>Results</p> <p>The statistical analyses were not clearly reported, which makes it difficult to evaluate</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>their appropriateness. Again, the statistics were not presented in a conventional manner.</p> <p>The figures are unnecessary, and the tables are not adequately reported. A statistician should revise this part. Again, there is no coherence between the objectives and the statistics reported here.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>In this section, the authors should discuss the results obtained in their study. Both similarities and differences of the results should be presented in the context of previous research findings, as well as stating the study's limitations and clinical impacts. Authors should avoid repeating the results already presented in the preceding section. They should also avoid lengthy introductions to findings from previous studies, which would be more appropriately placed in the introduction section. The discussion section could better demonstrate an overall comprehension of the relationship between previous studies, and results from the current study, while avoiding over-interpretation or misinterpretation. For example, when discussing the delay of surgical intervention, conclusions cannot be drawn when differences are not statistically significant. Discussion points that are unrelated to</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the main study objectives should also be removed.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Elaine de Guise
Department, University & Country	Dep. Psychology, University of Montreal, Canada