



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research</a>                  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_AJORR_55145   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Posttraumatic stress disorder: An unseen trouble in orthopaedic trauma |
| Type of the Article      | Review 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 (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) |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments | <p><b>Keywords:</b></p> <p>i) Not provided.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> please include 3 to 5 keywords.</p> <p><b>Extent of the problem:</b></p> <p>i) This particular section fails to describes the area of interest in a detailed manner ( i.e. magnitude of the problem. The problem at hand is PTSD in orthopedics trauma).</p> <p>ii) The first paragraph is more concentrated on problem statement. In the same paragraph, there is no clear link between the 2<sup>nd</sup> &amp; 3<sup>rd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> &amp; 4<sup>th</sup> sentences. In general, this paragraph drifts away from the main focus of the section (extent of problem), as it covers issues more than extent of problem. It talks of possible pathophysiology of PTSD, which is a relevant information in wrong section.</p> <p>iii) Paragraph 2: this contains information regarding extent of the problem in orthopedic cases. It has been well written.</p> <p>iv) Paragraph 2: Like in the 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, the authors drift away from the focus of this section in paragraph 3. The opening sentence is very well, talking about pediatric patients, and in the following sentences, nothing is said about the pediatric patients.</p> <p>v) Citation of references used not made for some sentences or phrases. Sentences which carry a strong information must be cited example sentence 1-3 of paragraph 4 requires citation as they are clearly not authors words but rather obtsined from literature.</p> <p>vi) Grammatical errors noted.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: this section lacks information regarding extent of the problem at large. The authors should do thorough literature review to address this issue in respect to incidence/prevalence of PTSD in orthopedic trauma from different part of the world. They should try to include the extent of this problem in respect to risk factors like sex, age, occupation, marital status, education level and many others.</b></p> <p><b>THE AUTHORS FAIL TO MAKE CITATION OF REFERENCES USED NOT MADE FOR SOME SENTENCES OR PHRASES THROUGHOUT THE MANUSCRIPT.</b></p> |   |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      | <p><b>The Title:</b></p> <p>i) The length is Ok</p> <p>ii) The title is well written and is attractive.</p>   |   |



iii) **Recommendation: None**

**Abstract:**

- i) Number of words is within the range of journal requirement.
- ii) It contains the aim of the review.
- iii) It is not a good summary that stands out alone and is informative.

**Recommendation: None**

**Introduction:**

- i) The introduction describes briefly the area of interest.
- ii) The rationale for review is not clearly elaborated.
- iii) The information is not well arranged though the authors have a very good points. The authors speak of symptoms, then go on to list the synonyms of PTSD, and then again they describe symptoms used to diagnose PTSD. This is confusing for a reader. As a reader, I personally appreciate that finish one point then describe another.
- iv) Grammatical errors noted.
- v) Citation of references used not made for some sentences or phrases. Example: the entire paragraph 4 has only one citation:

**Recommendation: Arrange the introduction in a better flow-able manner (example when authors say PTSD has evolved in names and symptoms, then next sentence they may mention all the names used and after that they talk about the symptoms since first described and the criteria for diagnosing), and address the queried points listed above. The citation of relevant literature should be made before starting new sentence. Few grammatical errors to be corrected.**

**Impact of the problem:**

- i) Paragraph 1: The authors have described very well the general effects of PTSD. The flow of information is good.
- ii) Paragraph 2: The paragraph contains relevant information regarding the section, it may need some paraphrasing of some sentences, otherwise, it is okay.
- iii) Some grammatical errors

**Recommendation: the section requires some few paraphrasing of sentences, and grammatical corrections.**

**Addressing the problem:**

- i) Paragraph 1: has nothing to do with addressing the problem, the information in the paragraph is somewhat repetition of information in preceding sections. Please omit the paragraph and fit the information in the paragraph in



SDI Review Form 1.6

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>appropriate sections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>ii) Paragraphs 2 and 3: These paragraphs contain relevant information regarding the section, the authors have done justice to the section in these paragraphs, they have been well written, though there are few grammatical errors, but it is a good piece of information.</li><li>iii) Paragraph 2: Like in the 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, the authors drift away from the focus of this section in paragraph 3. The opening sentence is very well, talking about pediatric patients, and in the following sentences, nothing is said about the pediatric patients.</li><li>iv) Citation of references used not made for some sentences or phrases.</li><li>v) Grammatical errors noted.</li></ul> <p><b>Recommendation: Please cite the references. Make some grammatical corrections</b></p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i) The first sentence is missing a solid base from the review, as the authors have not done an extensive literature review on the prevalence of PTSD in orthopedic trauma. To make such a strong concluding remark one needs enough information. I will thus recommend that the authors omit this sentence or include more literature to supports such a claim.</li><li>ii) The rest of section of conclusion is appropriate, and the authors have given recommendation, which is very practical.</li></ul> <p><b>Recommendation: address the issue raised</b></p> <p><b>References:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i) References written according to journal's guidelines.</li></ul> <p><b>Recommendation: None</b></p> |  |
|--|---|--|



SDI Review Form 1.6

|                                  |   |  |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments | <p><b>General Comments</b></p> <p>This manuscript describes the Posttraumatic stress disorder in orthopaedic trauma. It is a narrative review that has the potential to serve as baseline for future studies that examine the incidence of PTSD in patient who sustained orthopedic injuries. In its present form, considerable improvements in the write-up are necessary.</p> <p><b>Structure and length:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) It is moderately lengthy paper</li> <li>ii) The article is neither well organized nor well balanced.</li> <li>iii) It has some relevant information.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendation: the article requires to be re- organized. It would be beneficial if the authors include more information regarding the incidence of PTSD in relation to various risk factors. This will help the orthopedic surgeons to know the possible risk factors hence consider issues of PTSD when managing trauma patients.</b></p> <p><b>Logic:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) The article has not been written clearly in some sections.</li> <li>ii) There is some violation of grammar though it does not hinder one to grab the information easily.</li> <li>iii) There is no logically consistency in some of paragraphs throughout the text.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendation: the article may require rephrasing and rearrangement.</b></p> <p><b>Scientific quality rating</b></p> <p><b>Novelty and originality:</b> The idea of the review is good. There is some contribution of the article to knowledge pool.</p> <p><b>Importance and impact:</b> The information in the review has some degree of significant importance, and may lead advancement in the relevant field of research. It is likely, that this article can be cited in the future.</p> <p><b>Relevance:</b> The article is not misleading yet it is not entirely scientific sound.</p> <p><b>Completeness of presentation:</b> The presentation is beyond the standard for complete scientific article at its present state.</p> |  |
|----------------------------------|---|--|

**PART 2:**

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> (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) |
| <b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b> | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |  |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name:                            | <b>Karpal Singh Sohal</b>                    |
| Department, University & Country | <b>University in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania</b> |