



# Pre-submission Review Report

## *Message from the Peer Reviewer*



Thank you for choosing Enago to assist you in peer reviewing. We have carefully reviewed your manuscript and have performed a comprehensive evaluation of your manuscript. Based on this evaluation, we have prepared this report that gives you an assessment of your paper, along with a list of problem areas and suggested revisions organized in an order of priority, to minimize chances of journal rejection.

ST

## Manuscript Details

Assignment Code	MASUE-1	Total Word Count	5200
Manuscript Title:	-----		
Journal URL:	<a href="https://www.tandfonline.com/toc/ioto20/current">https://www.tandfonline.com/toc/ioto20/current</a>		

## Detailed Review of Each Section

### ○ Title Page

The title of any research plays an important role in manuscript preparation. The title should be brief and concise, easily understandable, give an idea about the type of the study and study setting. The study was conducted retrospectively, thus it is mandatory to mention the same in the title. It is suggested to the authors that they modify the title even though it is concise and informative in order to attract the readers.

Journal guidelines suggest that title should be in bold with an initial capital letter for any proper nouns.

*Author Affiliation guidelines* - All authors of a manuscript should include their full name and affiliation on the cover page of the manuscript.

One author will need to be identified as the corresponding author, with their email address.

ICMJE guidelines for the title page suggest: Each author's highest academic degrees should be listed. The name of the department(s) and institution(s) or organizations where the work should be attributed should be specified. Most electronic submission systems require that authors provide full contact information, including land mail and e-mail addresses, but the title page should list the corresponding authors' telephone and fax numbers and e-mail address.

The spelling of 'running' is wrong in title page.

### ○ Abstract

The abstract should have Background, Aims/Objectives, Material and Methods, Results, Conclusions and Significance accompanied by 5-10 key words in it. The current study abstract is of total 220 words which includes research purpose, method, result and conclusion. There are no keywords below the abstract.

The authors have briefly described about the aim of the research but have not mentioned the inclusion and exclusion criteria of the study in the abstract, due to this the abstract looks much more vague. It just mentioned about other patient details. The statement "25 patients who had used contralateral hearing aid regularly after surgery and the ones who had used cochlear implants only." is very broad and unclear. More clarification is sought in this case. The abstract exceeds the word limit by 22 words. Thus, authors need to make sure that the word limit in the abstract meets the journal's limit.

### ○ Introduction

Introduction of any article/manuscript should present the background of the research problem. It comprises of basic idea about the condition on which the research is carried out and also discusses the

previous literature and need for the study. In this section, the authors have described about cochlear implant, conventional hearing aid, speech and hearing development. It also elaborated on the aim of the study to compare language development and auditory performance of patients who were applied cochlear implants by using conventional aids simultaneously to the opposite ear. But still the manuscript lacks the structured arrangement in introduction. The author needs to explain the relationship of cochlear implant and total sensorineural hearing loss in much more elaborate manner. The manuscript also lacks the epidemiology or etiology data evidences and the importance of the research problem. The journal indicates that in case of "Original article" type, the article should not exceed 08 number of pages including the reference section. This manuscript is of total 15 pages including the references. But, I don't find any room in introduction section for any deletion of the content. The introduction is still missing the element of epidemiology and impact of research problem in the society. Thus, introduction requires major modification work especially in the following areas:

- Background of the study needs to have more information regarding cochlear implants.
- Authors need to add up more evidences as there are near about nil current research discussed to prove the rationale of the current study.
- Certain suggestions of evidences:
  - <https://asa.scitation.org/doi/abs/10.1121/1.1539520>
  - <https://asa.scitation.org/doi/abs/10.1121/1.407223>
  - <https://www.cochlear.com/uk/for-professionals/sound-connection/bimodal-hearing>
  - <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/000348940811700601>
  - <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4399180/>

This journal has published similar articles recently. Much has been reported in almost similar clinical condition by other researchers, and hence, the author is advised to strengthen the literature review carefully by referring to the above links. The rationale behind conducting the study should be emphasized at the end of this section in the manuscript.

## ○ **Methods**

The methodology section of the study includes all the important parameters because based on this and result analysis, the conclusion of the study is formed. It explains clearly about the study procedure and study analysis.

The Methods section should aim to be sufficiently detailed such that others with access to the data would be able to reproduce the results. If an organization was paid or otherwise contracted to help conduct the research (examples include data collection and management), then this should be detailed in the methods.

In the methodology section of this manuscript, the authors have mentioned about the time frame when the research was conducted and the patients included in the study. There is no clear idea about the demographic data of the patients. Also, the study is conducted retrospectively. Based on the journal guidelines mentioned on the journal page, they generally don't accept the retrospective studies unless they present new information to the clinical community. The sample size appears to be adequate, but please consider the above instruction from the journal.

In this study, authors have used various test/scales like following:

1. Pre-School Language Test

## 2. LittleEARS Auditory Questionnaire

It is very good that authors have used one of the scale into the local language. In general terms, whenever research is being carried out and the outcome measures are scales or questionnaire, it is always better to have them in local language. But that is not the case in remaining three scales. I would like to know whether the subjects taken for the study were well aware of the English language. If they were not, then it is mandatory to use translated version. Thus, authors, please make a note of this and do the needful before submitting to the journal for publication. Also, please ensure that the local version was validated.

It is recommended to have a study flow chart which will describe about the study in detail rather than sentence format as it will help to draw the attention of the readers.

Further clarity is also to be provided about the duration of use of the instrument. In general, the recommended statistics for comparison of groups is ANOVA for parametric tests and Kruskal Wallis for non-parametric tests. The use of correlation tests is not clear or relevant.

### ○ Results

The result section of this manuscript is too long. It replicates the same thing which is explained or stated in the table. It is suggested to concise this section of the study.

Results should be in logical sequence in the text, tables, and figures, giving the main or most important findings first. Do not repeat all the data in the tables or figures in the text; emphasize or summarize only the most important observations. Give numeric results not only as derivatives (for example, percentages) but also as the absolute numbers from which the derivatives were calculated, and specify the statistical significance attached to them, if any. Restrict tables and figures to those needed to explain the argument of the paper and to assess supporting data. Use graphs as an alternative to tables with many entries; do not duplicate data in graphs and tables. Avoid nontechnical uses of technical terms in statistics, such as “random” (which implies a randomizing device), “normal,” “significant,” “correlations,” and “sample.”

Separate reporting of data by demographic variables, such as age and sex, facilitate pooling of data for subgroups across studies and should be routine, unless there are compelling reasons not to stratify reporting, which should be explained.

### ○ Discussion

The discussion section talks about the research problem and data analysis in the current study with the earlier similar studies. It is useful to begin the discussion by briefly summarizing the main findings, and explore possible mechanisms or explanations for these findings. Emphasize the new and important aspects of this study and align the findings in context of the totality of the relevant evidence. State the limitations of the study, and explore the implications of the findings for future research and for clinical practice or policy.

### ○ Conclusion

The conclusion of this manuscript is very brief and informative. This is one of the key feature of this study. It would have been better if the authors would have highlighted or mentioned about the limitation and future scope of the study in this section.

## ○ References

There are total 25 references in this manuscript and all of them are superscripted in the main text. The references should be formatted as per instructions in the link [https://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/authors/style/reference/tf\\_NLM.pdf](https://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/authors/style/reference/tf_NLM.pdf)

The journal has certain guidelines for the reference section:

Order Numerical order based on first appearance in the text. Form of author name Surname and initials. Capitalize surnames and enter spaces within surnames as they appear in the document you are citing, e.g. Van Der Horn or van der Horn; De Wolf or de Wolf or DeWolf. Initials follow surname without punctuation, without spaces or full points between initials, e.g. Author AA. Place family designations of rank after the initials, without punctuation, e.g. Author AA Jr.

Journal titles are abbreviated according to ISO 4. See <http://www.issn.org/services/online-services/access-to-the-ltwa/>

Journal title abbreviations should not include full points, except at the end of the title; see examples below. Do not abbreviate journal titles consisting of a single word

## ○ Figures

There are total 03 figures in this manuscript and all of them are cited in the text. In all these figures in which graphical representation is shown, y-axis is not clear.

Figures, charts should always be self-explanatory.

The journal guidelines for say:

*“Figures should be high quality (1200 dpi for line art, 600 dpi for grayscale and 300 dpi for colour, at the correct size). Figures should be supplied in one of our preferred file formats: EPS, PS, JPEG, GIF, or Microsoft Word (DOC or DOCX).”*

The authors should take note of the above criteria before submitting the manuscript for the publication.

## ○ Tables

There are total 06 tables in this text. All of them require formatting. As all the data which are in decimal are denoted by “,” instead of “.”. For e.g. 0.01 is written as 0,01. This should be corrected immediately. Tables are incomplete, does not describe the n, the scales of measurement, the statistical tests used, etc.

Journal guidelines say: *“Tables should present new information rather than duplicating what is in the text. Readers should be able to interpret the table without reference to the text. Please supply editable files”*

It is strongly suggested to reduce the length of the result section. The tables should be self-explanatory.

## ○ Format

The manuscript is not as per standard organized structure. Many points were repeated. The major formatting required is to reduce the number of pages in the manuscript as journal will prefer articles up to 08 pages only. Apply the usual structure of a scientific article, limit your report to what is relevant for the study, restructure the text, and use comprehensible English. Please use British (-ize) spelling style consistently throughout your manuscript.

○ **Style**

The style of the manuscript should adhere to the journal guidelines as it is currently not structured appropriately. Authors are suggested to visit journal guideline page and ICJME guideline page before submitting the article for the final publication.

○ **Authorship**

Authorship details were provided accurately by the authors.

## Quality of Research

○ **Originality of research [Rating: Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor]**

**Fair.** The research problem and the research conducted are unique, however, this manuscript should present a structured way of research expression to the readers. The authors are advised to add supportive statements for the rationale behind conducting their research so that the journal's editor can understand the importance of the findings. They should refer to recent articles to understand what has already been reported till date, and in what ways their research approach is unique.

○ **Significance to field [Rating: Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor]**

**Fair.** These kind of studies do have greater significance once proven in the clinical field and practice in medical science. As mentioned earlier, the structure of the study presentation needs improvement. The conclusion of this study supports using of contralateral side hearing aid after cochlear implant which helps in developing language and auditory performance. If the same thing can be done with randomized controlled trial, the study will be stronger in proving the concept.

○ **Soundness of study design [Rating: Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor]**

**Fair.** The major issue with this manuscript is the methodology section. It has also been reiterated in the above sections regarding the study design. The study is unclear about the duration of use of the instrument. The use of correlation tests is not clear or relevant.

○ **Ethical soundness [Rating: Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor]**

**Good.** The authors have also taken the approval from University Ethics Committee of Clinical Researches.

○ **Sufficiency of data analysis [Rating: Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor]**

**Poor.** The data analysis is very much critical part of any study. The recommended statistics for the comparison of groups is ANOVA for parametric tests and Kruskal Wallis for non-parametric tests. The use of correlation tests is not clear or relevant.

○ **Overall Rating [Rating: Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor]**

**Fair.** Based on above points, the overall rating of this manuscript is fair. The manuscript should be improved in line with the above suggestions before proceeding for submission to journal.

## Manuscript Quality

### ○ Clarity of presentation [Rating: Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor]

**Fair.** The presentation of this manuscript requires major modifications. There are no keywords in the abstract, even the flow of the manuscript and language clarity is not obvious. Modifications required in relevant sections are mentioned above.

### ○ Organization and Structure [Rating: Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor]

**Fair.** The major concern of this manuscript is the organization and structure. Absence of keywords, grammatical errors, and further scope of making the result and discussion concise/focused are highlighted above.

### ○ Evidence supports [Rating: Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor]

**Good.** One of the key areas of this manuscript is the evidence support of the study. Few of the references as mentioned below used by the authors are good.

1. G.M. O'Donoghue, Cochlear implants in children: Principles, practice and predictions, J.R.SocMed. 1996; 89: 345-347.
2. T.Y.C. Ching, P. Incerti, M. Hill, Binaural benefits for adults who use hearing aids and cochlear implants in opposite ears, Ear and Hearing. 2004; 25: 9-21.

### ○ Adequacy of literature review [Rating: Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor]

**Good.** The literature review of this manuscript is good but recent evidences or articles are also to be mentioned. If these recent evidences are discussed in comparison to their research approach, it will add enough clarity to the rationale behind conducting the study.

### ○ Overall Rating [Rating: Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor]

**Fair to Good.** Based on above descriptions and ratings, the overall rating of this manuscript ranges between fair and good. The manuscript should be modified according to the suggestions provided above to enhance the quality of presentation of content.

## Suitability to Journal

### ○ Journal Scope and manuscript compatibility

Acta Oto-Laryngologica is an international journal for translational otolaryngology and head- and neck surgery. It is the official journal for the European Federation of Oto-Rhino-Laryngological Societies (EUFOS). Thus, if the article gets published when fulfilled by journal criteria and above mentioned modifications, it will definitely get more citations.

### ○ Journal Coverage and manuscript compatibility

This journal is interested in research related to Inner and Middle Ear, Otoneurology, Audiology, etc. Also there are 12 issues a year, thus indicating towards fast publication process. The journal is indexed in



Biological Abstracts, BIOBASE/Current Awareness in Biological Sciences, EMBASE (Elsevier), Index Medicus (NLM), Medline (NLM), PubMed (NLM), Science Citation Index (Clarivate Analytics), Science Citation Index Expanded (Clarivate Analytics), and Scopus (Elsevier). Thus, the manuscript completely falls into the journal coverage area and thus is compatible for publication.

#### ○ **Journal Quality and manuscript compatibility**

The journal has an impact factor of 1.157. Ranking: 29/41 (Otorhinolaryngology). Though the aim and scope of the journal and the quality of research published match the authors' manuscript, yet the manuscript needs major modifications to be done before publication.

## Next Steps

The following are the three most important improvements that the author needs to make.

- Organization and structure of the manuscript
- Addition of keywords in the abstract of the manuscript
- Result analysis, charts and tables need to be changed as they aren't self-explanatory.

The following are the three most important strengths of this paper which the author should not lose in the process of revision.

- Research problem and amount of work done for the research.
- Evidence support and literature review.

## Current Manuscript Status and Recommendation

- Overall flow of the manuscript, grammatical errors, and writing style should be corrected before publication.

Recommendation: See Advance Editing

## Our Commitment

Enago recognizes the need to deliver high-quality services and to guarantee the security of your information at all times. This belief is reflected in our commitment to establishing and maintaining systems and processes that are compliant with the ISO quality and IT security management standards.

Our relationship with you does not end here. This is just the beginning!

Enago is committed to help you get your research published and we will ensure that your future needs are met. For any assistance, simply mail us at [publish@enago.com](mailto:publish@enago.com). Your dedicated assignment manager will be happy to help you with all your needs and queries.

