



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>)



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Result has to be re-writing. Some many discussions under result not acceptable. A lot of repetitions Data analyses not discussed for example how many believed religion was helpful and how many believed information from internet was more helpful than information from health carers. To what extent was a coping mechanism better than the other in the study? The breakdown of the coping mechanism with explanations should not be under result. A table to grade the coping mechanisms would be more helpful. Many sort information from internet.....but only 8 had formal education!	1. "Some many discussions under result not acceptable".....we have gone through the entire discussion and did not seem to identify anything unacceptable as far as presentation of qualitative data is concern. We would be grateful if the review could point to the specific areas in the data that contain unacceptable materials. 2. "Data analyses not discussed for example how many believed religion was helpful and how many believed information from internet was more helpful than information from health carers. To what extent was a coping mechanism better than the other in the study?"..... we wish to respectfully remind our reviewer that, the study was a qualitative study which does not necessarily deal with numbers, like in quantitative studies. Emphasis in qualitative research is in reporting of phenomenon from the perspectives of participants. For instance, instead of using numbers, qualitative researchers mostly use terminologies such as "the majority of the participants, a few of the participants, many of the participants, all of the participants, etc", in the presentation of results and that was what we did in the result. 3. "To what extent was a coping mechanism better than the other in the study?"..... we concluded by stating that, religious beliefs was the most important coping strategy as it was employed by the majority of the participants.....line 20-21. Again, we identified a relationship between information-seeking and acceptance in the data.....line 245-246. Hence, we observed that, the majority of participants in the study who employed information-seeking as a coping strategy, also accepted their condition....line 331 "The breakdown of the coping mechanism with explanations should not be under result. A table to grade the coping mechanisms would be more helpful.".....qualitative results are presented in the form of stories, supported with verbatim quotes from the participants, as presented in our article. The coping mechanisms cannot be graded in tables because, in qualitative research, researchers do not look for statistical differences between variables. Once again, qualitative studies deal with phenomenon from the perspectives of the participants. "Many sort information from internet.....but only 8 had formal education!"..... 8 participants is a significant value as it represent more than half of the participants.
Minor REVISION comments	Many words and sentences not relevant to the paper were used Too few sample size to make a statement. While writing the discussion, no need to personalize the study...statement like"it was not surprising to the researchers...."could be edited. Conclusion included few issues that were not in the body of article.	"Many words and sentences not relevant to the paper were used".....we would be grateful if you could give specifics so we can take note and act accordingly "Too few sample size to make a statement.".....with qualitative studies, sample size is always determined by data saturation. Our data got saturated after interviewing the 13th person. Saturation in qualitative studies is reached when new emerging themes or ideas are no long forthcoming with subsequent data collections. Qualitative studies are context specific and generalizations is not an objective "While writing the discussion, no need to personalize the study...statement like"it was not surprising to the researchers...."could be edited."..... it was not surprising to the researchers" was edited and the statement reconstructed



SDI Review Form 1.6

		“Conclusion included few issues that were not in the body of article” the conclusion was reconstructed
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The result and discussion needs to be worked on.	The discussion and conclusion were restructured and a few errors in the result were corrected

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> Patients’ first names were mention and the region of the study as well. It may be possible to link patients to the study. Patients could be given numbers to ensure privacy	What appears in the data are not participants’ real names. They are pseudonyms. In qualitative research, we enjoy confidentiality by representing participants’ real names with either numbers or pseudonyms. So, the researchers chose pseudonyms. However, we can change to numbers if that is preferred. This is stated under ethical considerations “To ensure confidentiality and anonymity of the participants, the researchers replaced the real identities of all the participants with pseudonyms in reporting the findings of the study.”