

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORR_91838
Title of the Manuscript:	FUNCTIONAL OUTCOME OF UNSTABLE INTER TROCHANTERIC FRACTURES WITH OSTEOPOROSIS TREATED WITH TYPE II PROXIMAL FEMORAL NAIL
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Intro – Revise word significantly as to use this scientifically statistics required</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need to define stable vs unstable early on to make it clear to readers</li> <li>- Please use the words “occurrence” or “incidence” when describing increase in fractures</li> <li>- first paragraph requires re-phrasing as not at all clear</li> <li>- poor grammar generally, difficult to follow argument</li> </ul> <p><b>Materials and methods – rephrasing required in abstract. Consider “This is a prospective...”</b></p> <p><b>Sounds like a cohort study. This should be stated.</b></p> <p><b>Results (abstract) – “most” to be deleted</b></p> <p><b>Please use the past tense throughout</b></p> <p><b>Delete “considerable”</b></p> <p><b>Revise “negligible” to “minimal”</b></p> <p><b>Results (manuscript) – require more than just description. Statistical analysis needed to determine significance of functional improvement, however clear it may be descriptively. No confounders or biases mentioned which is a glaring error.</b></p> <p><b>Discussion: bad practise to quote brands in a scientific paper.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Biomechanical statements require references</li> <li>- No flow between the paper's findings and the literature research papers quoted and tabulated.</li> </ul> <p><b>Conclusion - Already known standard treatment for these fractures, but one cannot claim that it is “more favourable” as the study was not comparing one implant with another.</b></p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Poor grammar throughout made it an extremely difficult read. Low numbers of patient in the study and no statistical analysis for what is routine treatment of these fractures. Due to the above factors, the paper would have to undergo major revision prior to acceptance. Ideally a native English speaker would be needed to peruse through it, as well as a statistician, prior to resubmission.	

### 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Njalalle Baraza
Department, University & Country	Aga Khan University Hospital, Kenya