



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMMR_27439
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSING CLUBFOOT SEVERITY AND MONITORING TREATMENT PROGRESS USING THE PIRANI SCORING SYSTEM
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 <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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Language:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is obvious from the manuscript that the authors are not native English speakers. There are several grammatical errors as well as sentence structures to revise throughout the manuscript. <p>Introduction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introduction is too long. Most readers will know what clubfoot and Ponseti method of casting is. Please cite the original Ponseti paper without explaining it in detail in the Introduction. I would prefer more lines on the incidence and current treatment algorithms in Nigeria in the Introduction. 2. "Outcome of this study will help in predicting the probable patients that will benefit from tenotomy, and also assist in estimating number of casting session that may be required. This in turn will assist the parent /caregiver to prepare both psychologically and financially for the treatment which may help in reducing the rate of dropout during treatment." – This does not have to be mentioned in the Introduction. It has greater value in Discussion/Conclusion. 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>3. "This study is aimed at assessing the severity and progress of clubfoot treatment using Pirani score." – Consider revising to "This study aims to evaluate the reliability of the Pirani score in (i) assessing severity of clubfoot and, (ii) monitoring progress of treatment.</p> <p>Methodology</p> <p>1. "It was a hospital-based prospective study designed to predict the severity and monitor progress of treatment of clubfoot using the Pirani classification system" – Consider revising this sentence as it does not reflect the true aim of the study. Align to aim written under Introduction.</p> <p>2. Specify explicitly inclusion and exclusion criteria</p> <p>3. What was the criteria before foot abduction orthoses (FAO) was initiated?</p> <p>4. Describe the full protocol for use of the FAO.</p> <p>5. The methodology section overall is poorly written without much detail on patient selection, inclusion and exclusion criteria, how many patients were excluded based on criteria, who did the casting, who did the scoring, was scoring blinded, was data analysis blinded etc.</p> <p>6. The appropriate tests to use to check if Pirani scoring is correlated with the midfoot and hindfoot scores as well as the number of casts would be to do correlational analysis with</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Pearson correlation coefficient. Please state if this was done and present your results clearly.</p> <p>Results</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Please provide a table of all patients with clinical details and demographic information please. This can be combined with the variables seen in Table 2.2. Mean and standard deviation can be presented together rather than in separate columns of the table 2.3. Table 3 is hard to read. Suggest doing correlational analysis and present scatter plots and a summary table of the correlation coefficients and p-values. Similarly for Tables 4 and 5. <p>Discussion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The entire discussion section needs to be reformatted for better flow and language. The aim of the paper is to evaluate correlation of Pirani score to severity of disease and monitoring of treatment. Much of the discussion seems to focus drawing epidemiological comparisons from current literature. Please summarise epidemiological differences in one paragraph. Second paragraph should discussing severity of clubfoot in this population with comparison from literature. Third paragraph should discuss correlation of Pirani score with severity of disease. The forth paragraph should discuss correlation of Pirani score with	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>monitoring of treatment. The fifth paragraph should expound on strengths and weaknesses of the study. One more paragraph can be included on the way forward before the conclusion.</p> <p>2. There are mixed findings in current literature with regards to correlation of Pirani score. A table comparing 3-4 key study findings would be interesting and would add value to this paper. Also, why do the authors think that they had good correlation in this paper? This should be discussed as well.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Title: I would prefer an assertive title that catches the eye of the reader rather than a descriptive title. Would the authors be open to a title like “The Pirani Scoring System Is Effective In Assessing Severity and Monitoring Treatment of Clubfeet in African Children.”</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>This is a study arising from a developing nation where resources are limited and there is a need to establish synchronised clinical pathways for treatment of common conditions – of which clubfoot is one. It may be of importance to the local context but not necessarily to that of an international audience. I believe it would still be of value to publish this article provided the authors are able to undertake the extensive revision that is needed in both the language, data analysis and format of the methodology and discussion sections. I can see that the authors have put in good effort and that has to be commended.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Hamid Rahmatullah Bin Abd Razak</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Singapore General Hospital, Singapore</i>