

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORR_94419
Title of the Manuscript:	Anatomical and surgical basis for the treatment of paralytic knees
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajorr.com/index.php/AJORR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<u>01</u> There is a plethora of sentences in the text without reference to a previous study (or studies) in order to give evidence to their statements. Without references, these statements would be mere assumptions or allegations by the authors of the manuscript. Therefore, each of these sentences need at least one reference to back up their statement. <u>02</u> This manuscript looks like a book chapter. A number of references was included in this review, but there is no way to know whether or not the authors picked up the references that were more aligned to what they believe concerning the subject. This can characterize selection bias and to make sure that every study on the subject is included. A lack of systematic selection of studies could lead to biased interpretation of results. The absence of objective and systematic selection criteria in review method substantially results in a number of methodological shortcomings leading to clear bias of the author's interpretation and conclusions. Therefore, some methodology for the selection of the studies must be used by the authors.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bruno Chrcanovic
Department, University & Country	Malmö University, Sweden