

Review Form2

Book Name:	Medicine and Medical Research: New Perspectives
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2460
Title of the Manuscript:	PROSPECTIVE STUDY OF OUTCOME OF DEPRESSED SKULL FRACTURE AND ITS MANAGEMENT
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	The authors present a single center small observational study involving 50 patients with depressed skull fractures. They describe the incidence and characterize the injuries they encountered. While it is well-written, the structure is odd making it a little difficult to follow. Also, it becomes very dry and could probably be better written. Page 1, Column 2, Line 4 There should be a space between “conservative” and “and” Page 1, Column 2, Line 7 There should be a space between “well” and “as” Page 1, Column 2, Lines 9-11 This one sentence is ambiguous and vague. It should describe the hypothesis of the study or the purpose of the study. Since this is an observational study, it should say something about reporting the incidence of something or characterize the natural course of a disease process or something. With the first half of the statement, the results should spend more time sharing the actual intracranial injuries with depressed skull fractures. In fact, a table dedicated to the frequency of various intracranial injuries would be appropriate since it seems like this is the primary objective of the study. For the second half of this statement, it is not plausible for this manuscript to accomplish. No observational study can establish a plan of management for any disease process. There is no way that 50 patients would be enough to do this either. Pages 1-2 The materials and methods should only describe how a study is conducted. Since this is an observational study, it should only describe how information was obtained and collected. It feels like there is some cross over between materials and methods, to results. For example, treatment modalities and time to discharge were inadvertently recorded here. Also, was there IRB approval for this study? Was data collected prospectively or by chart review? Why were patients with hypertension and diabetes excluded? How was the number 50 chosen? Was there a power analysis or was it because of the dates of the study? Page 3, Column 2, Lines 13-16 More information is required from this dataset to support the final sentence is this paragraph. It feels unreasonable at this point for the authors to conclude on the sex ratio for depressed skull fracture is dependent on the amount of money they earn Page 3, Column, Line 15 The word “bread winner” should not be used here. It is a cliché euphemism. Pages 3-4 This discussion is overly long and wordy. There is a lot of results included here that should actually be recorded in the results section, maybe as a table. The discussion should describe how the results of this study compares to the literature, but also describe how the results apply to the purpose of the study – in this case, describing the intracranial injuries associated with depressed skull fractures and establishing a plan for management of depressed skull fractures (in case the authors are still keeping this as a goal of the study).	

Review Form2

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Joshua Sappenfield
Department, University & Country	University of Florida, USA