



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Neurology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORRIN_45387
Title of the Manuscript:	Psychological Adjustment among Persons with Spinal Cord Injury in the Tamale Metropolis, Ghana
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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	This paper is a well written and very interesting study. There are few modifications needed for its publication. The following sentences do not belong to the conclusion: "The Ministry of Health and other relevant stake holders in the health care delivery system should promote the services of the hospital chaplain in the care of persons with SCI in order to meet the spiritual needs of these persons. There must also be proper health education for persons with SCI and their families to enable them understand the multifaceted nature of SCI and aid in their adaption to the consequences of the injury. The only limitation of the study identified by the researchers was the representativeness of the sample. This is because, to ensure that rich and detailed data was obtained on the coping strategies of persons with SCI, the researchers employed a purposive sampling technique to recruit only participants who had a wealth of information to share on their experiences. As a result, the findings' replicability is limited to groups that share the same characteristics as the sample of this study." Those are not study conclusions. These sentences belong to discussion section. I would change the word "only" (345) for "main".	"The Ministry of Health and other relevant stake holders in the health care delivery system should promote the services of the hospital chaplain in the care of persons with SCI in order to meet the spiritual needs of these persons. There must also be proper health education for persons with SCI and their families to enable them understand the multifaceted nature of SCI and aid in their adaption to the consequences of the injury." The above paragraph was moved to the discussion column. "The only limitation of the study" "only" was changed to "main" "The only limitation of the study identified by the researchers was the representativeness of the sample. This is because, to ensure that rich and detailed data was obtained on the coping strategies of persons with SCI, the researchers employed a purposive sampling technique to recruit only participants who had a wealth of information to share on their experiences. As a result, the findings' replicability is limited to groups that share the same characteristics as the sample of this study." The above paragraph was moved to discussion as suggested but given a new heading as "limitations of the study"
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	