

Review of: "Comparison of Clinical and Radiological Diagnosis with Autopsy Findings in Fatal Traffic Accident Cases"

Massimo Montisci¹

¹ University of Padua, Italy

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The study addresses a crucial topic in emergency and forensic medicine, emphasizing the importance of autopsies in improving the diagnosis of traumatic injuries.

Strengths

The methodology used to compare clinical-radiological data with autopsy findings is well outlined.

An adequate sample size (146 cases) to draw statistically significant conclusions.

The use of appropriate statistical tests, such as kappa agreement, to assess concordance.

The results highlight discrepancies between clinical and autopsy diagnoses, offering valuable insights to improve trauma diagnostic protocols.

The article follows a conventional structure (Abstract, Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusions), which facilitates reading and understanding.

Weaknesses

Some sentences are verbose or repetitive and could be made more concise.

Minor grammar and syntax errors reduce readability, e.g.: "Some injuries often goes unnoticed" → "Some injuries often go unnoticed." "The necessary instruments used at this stage are..." → This sentence could be made more direct.

The study does not sufficiently discuss the limitations of its methodology, such as potential biases in case selection or variability in autopsy protocols.

Some references could be updated with more recent or additional sources. For example, include in the discussion the importance of CT and micro CT for forensic purposes (see Legal Medicine, 2017, 29:38-43)

Citations are sometimes repetitive (e.g., too many references tied to the same point).

Numerous and detailed tables, but some are not immediately readable. A more concise visual summary would be helpful.

Recommendations

If minor revisions are made, focusing on language aspects, simplifying the presentation of results, and also regarding the citations, I believe that the reviewed article (see weakness) certainly lives up to the journal.