



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>   |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JAMMR_54921   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | EPIDEMIOLOGICAL STUDY OF ROAD TRAFFIC ACCIDENT CASES ATTENDING TERTIARY CARE HOSPITAL OF KASHMIR: A CROSS SECTIONAL STUDY. |
| 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:

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



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

|                                     | <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>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The methodology is appropriate for this research. However, the study could have a much higher statistical value if you used statistical tests that go beyond the mere data description. In this moment, the aim is just to expose the characteristics of traffic accidents' victims. The tests that were used do not allow for the inferring or explanation of the causes behind these accidents, because there are no statistics indicating such causality.</li> <li>The discussion mustn't be a repetition of the results. You can name some data from the study to explain why you consider that those were the outcomes, or for comparing the study with other researches. However, in this case there is an excess of results in this section. I recommend that the authors reformulate it, providing more references that may explain the data. I recommend the article "Knowledge, perceived effectiveness and qualification of traffic rules, police supervision, sanctions and justice" by Alonso, Esteban, Montoro and Useche, which can be useful to explain some of the traffic infractions committed by the study subjects.</li> <li>For what concerns the style and writing of the manuscript, I think the authors may want to consider submitting their manuscript to a proof-reading. I found many, many typos throughout the whole text, especially in the abstract. For instance, repetitions (from the abstract: "[...] information regarding the the accident"), spaces that are strangely inserted or are just lacking (from the abstract: "Approximately 1/6th of the victims", notice the extra space between 1/6th and "of"; "[...]accidents(39%)", the brackets are attached to the word "accidents"; from the discussion, "[...] stability.However [...]]", there should be a space separating the period from the word "however", etc)), and plain misspelling (from the introduction: "verbral consent", "charcteristics", "employment", "timming"). Also, why is Traffic Accident presented as a singular noun/element in the abstract? Shouldn't we say "traffic accidents", since we are not talking about a specific accident but rather discussing a phenomenon? I had never seen it phrased like a singular entity. Please make sure to review your text and fix all the typos and mistakes!</li> </ul> <p>After a careful revision, I suggest that you ask the authors to re-write the article and re-send it to the journal after addressing the comments made during the revision.<br/>I remain at your disposal. Best regards,</p> |  |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The abstract is well presented.</li> <li>The introduction is adequate, but very generic. More information on the specific issues of the city and country where the research was conducted could be included.</li> <li>The results are well presented, but I recommend not repeating figures that are already mentioned in tables and figures, but rather just referring to them when appropriate.</li> <li>The conclusion is adequate in what concerns its content, but it is somehow scarce. The authors could include how they think this study will impact society, meaning, what can the results be useful for (emphasizing certain types of traffic campaigns aimed at X population, or on X risk factor; elaborating or modifying some laws on the topic, etc.)</li> </ul>   |  |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments    | <p>To sum up, the manuscript is overall well elaborated, but it basically consists of a recompilation of data that provide important information on a local level, without holding much scientific value. One option could be sending this article to a local scientific journal, where this information may be useful. Or else, send it again to this journal, but providing a new approach to the research, making an effort to know the causes of these accidents through appropriate statistical tests. In addition, the manuscript must clarify that the results could not be extrapolated to other populations, since the research was carried out on a sample with some very specific characteristics.</p>   |  |



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> <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> |
|---|--|---|
| <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>Francisco Alonso</b>                     |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Intras-University of Valencia, Spain</b> |