REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-50835   Date: 01-04-2025

Title: A COMPARATIVE STUDY 0F EFFICACY OF CECT VS FAST STUDY IN BLUNT TRAUMA ABDOMEN PATIENTS WITH SOLID ORGAN INJURY PATIENTS

Recommendation:

Accept as it is.................**YES.............**
Accept after minor revision.................
Accept after major revision ....
Do not accept (*Reasons below*) ....

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality	√			
Techn. Quality		√		
Clarity		√		
Significance			√	

Reviewer's Name: Dr Aamina

Reviewer's Decision about Paper: Recommended for Publication.

Comments (*Use additional pages, if required*)
.

Reviewer's Comment / Report

Abstract:
The abstract effectively presents the research aim, objectives, methodology, results, and conclusion. It clearly delineates the comparative accuracy of FAST and CECT in diagnosing solid organ injuries in blunt trauma abdomen patients. The inclusion of key statistical results strengthens the findings and supports the conclusion.

Strengths:

- Well-structured with clear articulation of the research problem.
- Provides a logical flow from research objectives to methodology and conclusion.
- Statistical data enhances credibility and clarity of results.
- The study underscores the importance of CECT as the gold standard, while acknowledging the utility of FAST in initial assessments.

Introduction:
The introduction successfully outlines the significance of the study, providing relevant epidemiological data on blunt abdominal trauma. It effectively contextualizes the role of FAST and CECT in clinical

REVIEWER'S REPORT

settings. The discussion on the advantages and limitations of both imaging modalities provides a balanced perspective.

Strengths:

- Comprehensive background on blunt abdominal trauma and its clinical challenges.
- Clear rationale for the comparative study of FAST and CECT.
- Well-articulated discussion on the ATLS protocol and its relevance in trauma assessment.

Methodology:
The study design is clearly described, outlining patient selection criteria, diagnostic procedures, and data collection. The inclusion of a sample size of 100 patients strengthens the reliability of the study.

Strengths:

- Clearly defined patient inclusion criteria.
- Prospective data collection enhances study validity.
- Appropriate use of both FAST and CECT scans for comparison.

Results:
The results provide a detailed comparison of diagnostic findings between FAST and CECT. The inclusion of demographic data and common causes of blunt abdominal trauma adds value to the analysis.

Strengths:

- Well-documented statistical findings.
- Logical correlation between injury detection rates and imaging modalities.
- Management outcomes (conservative vs. surgical) appropriately presented.

Conclusion:
The conclusion effectively summarizes the findings, reinforcing the superiority of CECT in detecting abdominal injuries, while acknowledging the utility of FAST for initial screening. The study's implications for clinical practice are well addressed.

Strengths:

- Strong summary of findings.
- Well-aligned with study objectives.
- Practical clinical relevance emphasized.

Overall Assessment:
The study is well-structured, informative, and clinically relevant. It provides a balanced discussion on the accuracy of FAST vs. CECT in blunt trauma abdomen patients, backed by strong statistical data. The study contributes valuable insights to trauma imaging protocols and decision-making in emergency settings.