

## Research letter

**Final title:** Sociodemographic and neurological profile of patients with spinal cord injury in a trauma hospital in Bangladesh

**Title at submission:** Socio-demographic and neurological profile of person with traumatic spinal cord injury in Bangladesh: Findings from a trauma hospital



OPEN ACCESS

### Correspondence

Md Mohiuddin  
mohicmc44@gmail.com

### Publication history

Received: 23 Oct 2025  
Accepted: 28 Dec 2025  
Published online: 30 Dec 2025

### Responsible editor

M Mostafa Zaman  
0000-0002-1736-1342

### Reviewers

D: Anonymous  
E Iffat Islam Khan  
0009-0000-0008-0184

### Keywords

spinal cord injuries, socio-demographic factors, falls, rehabilitation

### Funding

None

### Ethical approval

The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of National Institute of Traumatology and Orthopaedic Rehabilitation (Memo: 1791, Dated 23 May 2022).

### Trial registration number

Not applicable

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

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

### Reviewer D: Anonymous

**1. Comment** Figure caption incomplete . could be state: "Figure 1. Distribution of ASIA Impairment Scale Grades (A–D) among patients with TSCI (n=182)."

**Response** Revised as advised (Page 17, line 314-315)

**2. Comment** The results section provided comprehensive descriptive data. Some results repeat information already in the tables (unnecessary duplication). Multiple percentages do not sum to 100% in a few categories, but this is acceptable where multiple responses are allowed. required explicitly stated.

**Response** We reduced the text of the results as possible and refer the respective table for further details.

**3. Comment** Limitations need to be mentioned: No consideration of recall bias in patient interviews, No mention of lack of follow-up or outcome data, No discussion on absence of rehabilitation outcome measures.

**Response** We added the limitations (page 10, line 204 – 208)

### Reviewer E: Iffat Islam Khan, ORCID: 0009-0000-0008-0184

**4. Comment** Methods are not sufficient . Study of hospital record should be either retrospective or prospective ,that should be well mentioning. Not appropriate and not clear, poor quality.

**Response** Thank you so much for the valuable suggestion. Basically our study is the cross-sectional study and initially was identified from the hospital records. We have thoroughly revised the methods section to make clear.

**5. Comment** Cross tabulation between age and gender of the participants was not mentioned.

**Response** Thank you so much for you valuable suggestion. As we just described the demographic and clinical findings we are comfortable to keep as it is.

**6. Comment** Age data revealed 106 subject out of total subject 182. Rest of 76 subject frequency category was omitted.

**Response** This is an unintentional mistake. We have added the 76 data which was age  $\geq 50$  category.

**7. Comment** Clinical presentation variable was not appropriate as:

- Absent sensation (which body part was not mentioned)
- Bladder involvement was 100% of the total subject (Either Catheter or incontinence). No patient SCI had normal bladder as study revealed- should have clear mentioning.
- In study difficulties in walking was 4.9%. Rest 95.1% could walk despite 36.8% could not move their lower limbs. It was not clinically accepted and statically not accepted as well.
- Sub-classification of causes of fall from height should have separate column or tabulated.

**Response**

- We have removed the findings as we haven't recorded specifically
- We have revised in the text
- Our denominator was different and thanks for raising this issue. We have removed difficulty in walking option.
- We have given a separate column chart of sub classification of Fall from tree.

**Responsible editor:** M Mostafa Zaman, ORCID: 0000-0002-1736-1342

**8. Comment** We sent our decision, along with a revision request, for a Research Letter on 16 December. However, we have not yet received your response.

May I get it by tomorrow at noon? Let us know if you disagree with our decision. In such a case, we shall decline it to be time efficient.

I appreciate your understanding.

**Response** Thank you for your comments on our manuscript. I will prepare it as a research letter for your consideration.

Given the depth of the study, the methodology employed, and the statistical analysis conducted, I believe this article is suitable for a research letter format. It is nearly complete and can be submitted for the final review stage within the next two days.

I look forward to your decision.

**9. Comment** Waiting for your submission soon. A research article will require in-depth analysis (multivariate) and scholarly writing. An inadequate revision of the manuscript for an original article might require another round of review, even rejection. A simple descriptive analysis will never be accepted as an original article by any good journal.

By the time you prepare such a manuscript, the time for the special issue might be over. I guess from your tables that it will not turn suitable for a full length article. However, I shall be looking forward to an acceptable revised version of either type of article.

**Response** Thank you so much for your reminder. Please allow me today. I shall submit the revised version. Many thanks for your consideration.