



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		
Minor REVISION comments	1. In the result section under Religious belief, why did the authors only reflect the views of the Muslim participants,	The majority of the participants (11) were Muslims because the research setting is a Muslim dominated town. Only 2 of the respondents were Christians who reported other coping mechanisms but not on religious beliefs. In order to avoid biasness, the researchers asked general questions and allowed the participants to share with them, whatever coping mechanisms they believed worked for them. It would have been a leading question if the researchers had asked the Christian participants about religion even if they did not mention it in their responses
Optional/General comments	The issue of SCI is too common in Africa, and coping strategies need to be advanced to ease the burden on both the patients and the care givers. The authors were very detailed in their methodology and other processes of the research. Where I had issue was on sample size, but after reading the explanation given by the authors on limitation of the study, I became satisfied by the suggestion of the authors that future studies should beef up the sample size for generalisability.	The sample size indeed looks small but it was determined by saturation. By the time we interviewed the 13 th participants, we realized that, no new emerging ideas or themes were forthcoming. In such circumstances, the data is such to saturated and the qualitative researcher is expected to pause with data collection upon reaching saturation

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)	