

Review report

Final title: Short-term outcome of physiotherapy and surgical treatment of obstetrical brachial plexus palsy

Title at submission: Treatment of obstetrical brachial plexus palsy: experience in Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujib Medical University.



OPEN ACCESS

Reviewer: Taufiq Morshed, ORCID: 0000-0001-5594-092X

Overview

This study investigates the clinical characteristics, management, and outcomes of obstetric brachial plexus palsy (OBPP) at Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujib Medical University. The article is well-written but has a few areas for improvement. The statistical analysis could be presented more clearly, and some incidence results are confusing. Additionally, there are a few repetitive points in the discussion section that could be refined.

Correspondence

Krishna Priya Das
kpdas74@bsmmu.edu.bd

Publication history

Received: 22 Aug 2024
Accepted: 11 Apr 2025
Published online: 6 May 2025

Responsible editor

M Mostafa Zaman
0000-0002-1736-1342

Reviewer

Taufiq Morshed
0000-0001-5594-092X

Keywords

obstetric brachial plexus palsy,
rehabilitation, physiotherapy,
surgery

Funding

Research grant from Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujib Medical University, memo number: (No-BSMMU2022/3712(41), Dated 16 Apr 2022).

Ethical approval

Approved by IRB of Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujib Medical University (No-BSMMU2022/3712(41), Dated 16 Apr 2022).

Trail registration number

Not obtained

- | | | |
|---|-----------------|--|
| 1 | Comment | Is the title appropriate? |
| | Response | Revised title is:
Some suggestions - Clinical characteristics and treatment outcome of obstetrical brachial plexus palsy: experience in Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujib Medical University. |
| 2 | Comment | Does the abstract provide a complete and accurate description of the content of the article?
No
Line 46-47: No mention of outcome score |
| | Response | Outcome score has now mentioned. |
| 3 | Comment | Are the study objective(s) clearly stated and logical? No
Line 97-102,
i) The primary objective is the main goal of the study and addresses the central question the research seeks to answer.
ii) Secondary objectives are additional goals that the study aims to address alongside the primary objective. These may include other outcomes of interest, sub-group analyses, or exploring different aspects related to the primary objective. |
| | Response | Our primary objective was outcome of conservative treatment and secondary objectives were
i) Result of primary- Intra-plexus nerve surgery
ii) Results of secondary surgery- Soft tissue release and muscle or tendon transfer. |
| 4 | Comment | Are the methods described in sufficient detail so that the study could be reproduced? No
Line 156-157 - Statistical analysis is confusing |
| | Response | Rearrange the statistical analysis and correct it. |
| 5 | Comment | Are statistics used appropriately and described fully? No
Line 157-162: There is no clear information about which test was used to analyze each outcome score.
Line 169-172: How incidence was calculated? |
| | Response | Now it is clearly mention.
Data analysis was performed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences version 26.0 for Windows. The categorical variables (Gestational age group, sex, parity of mother, delivery type, presentation etc.) are presented as number percentages, while numerical variables (Age of presentation, gestational age at birth, birth weight etc.) were expressed as mean \pm standard deviation. The comparison was performed using the Chi-square test for categorical variables and the Unpaired t-test for continuous variables. A p-value of less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant. |
| 6 | Comment | Are the table(s) and figure(s) clear and appropriate to address the objective(s)? No
Line 365-367: Table 2 - Not clear |
| | Response | Now the tables are corrected and recheck all the values. |

© The Author(s) 2025; all rights reserved.

Published by Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujib Medical University (currently Bangladesh Medical University).

7 **Comment** Does the Discussion section have any repetition of results? **Yes**

Response Corrected the discussion and delete the duplication.

8 **Comment** Is the storytelling straightforward, clear (i.e., does not impede scientific meaning or cause confusion), and logical? **No**
Line 134-144: The surgical procedure should be clearly outlined.

Response Now it is more clear.

9 **Comment** Is the standard of English acceptable for publication? **No**
Line 114 - counsel
Line 115-119: Sentence incomplete, wrong tense

Response Corrected it

Responsible editor: **M Mostafa Zaman**, ORCID: [0000-0002-1736-1342](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1736-1342)

1 **Comment** Overall, the content is good, interesting, and may be clinically important. However, there is confusion about the study design. The authors describe it as a prospective observational study, but they have intervened with the patients at periodic intervals, so it cannot be an observational study.

Response I am sending the manuscript after correction.

2 **Comment** The abstract's word count should be ≤ 250 .

Response I also mention the corrected area: L-113, Data was collected from previous data, or information gathering from mother

3 **Comment** The main text indicates that the study was done in two departments (orthopaedics and Neonatology wards), but the Abstract claims that 90% of cases were referred from another department. Please synchronize texts.

Response L-241,142 biasness may be occurred

4 **Comment** The Conclusion in the Abstract and the main text need to be synchronized. The one in the abstract should be straightforward and supported by the data. Abstract lines 46-47 are confusing.

Response L-252- removal of the analysis.

5 **Comment** Highlights should not have more than five bullets.

Response L-257- removal of analysis

6 **Comment** Introduction: should not have the first author's view but all authors' views. It should be "we" rather than "I".

Response L-409, table 1, corrected, maternal data was shifted down to the lower part of table

7 **Comment** Methods: Add a reference for the MRC scale (lines 121-122). Methods should not refer to the tables or figures given for results (lines 116, 154). The flowchart has not been cited anywhere in the Methods section. The flowchart should be revised to clear the flow on the right and left sides without overlapping each other. Statistical analysis should clarify which test was done for what.

Response L-415, table-2, corrected

8 **Comment** Results: You have described everything here. You have tables for it. Pick up the main points for the description and refer to the tables for the rest. Table 2's information is given in two different paragraphs. Each paragraph may have one or more tables, but not the other way round.

Response L-425, little corrected of (unwilling to operate-5, waiting for operation-6, n=11)

9 **Comment** Discussion: Please begin the discussion with your key findings, then keep the subsequent paragraph around these key findings and limitations-strengths and clinical implications of the findings. The discussion is full of results. Please pick up the evidence from other papers and discuss it. Do not forget to provide implications of your findings for clinical practice and public health as well.

Response L-436, compiled both the picture in 3 (3A, primary surgery, 3B-secondary surgery)