

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>)

Review Form 1.6

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 | <p>There are many grammatical and typographical errors in the manuscript which need to be rectified</p> <p>In title pls write as pfna2</p> <p>Abstract</p> <p>Methods section is actually a part of background or intro. It only describes the purpose of the study. Pls explain the study design and the actual methodology by which the study was planned</p> <p>Pls stick to the same tense and not shift constantly between present and past tense</p> <p>All values may be presented as mean+/-standard deviation</p> <p>Pls don't use upper case in the middle of a sentence</p> <p>Conclusion section is entirely wrong. Pls write the actual findings of the study</p> <p>How can fracture hematoma be maintained in a nailing in all patients. Obviously with GT entry, for some patients the fracture would have been exposed. Not an acceptable advantage here</p> <p>The title mentioned osteoporosis. But there is no mention of osteoporosis assessment in the entire abstract (BMD?)</p> <p>Intro</p> <p>Very long. Pls stick to the relevant, recent literature on pfna2 and why this study was planned</p> <p>Methodology</p> <p>Very incomplete</p> <p>Define stable intertrochanteric fracture</p> <p>Consecutive patients?</p> <p>Describe Singh index</p> <p>Perioperative protocol?</p> <p>Follow-up protocol?</p> <p>Results</p> <p>Important findings must also be elaborated in the manuscript</p> <p>Tables are too many</p> <p>Pls present in a few bigger tables, instead of many small tables</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>It is not appropriate to have so many tables in discussion</p> <p>The literature review, if included, needs to be presented as a single large table</p> <p>What are the relevant findings</p> <p>What was the objective of the study and was it achieved?</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The conclusion is not in an acceptable format. Needs to be completely modified</p> | |
| 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: | Vibhu Viswanathan |
| Department, University & Country | University of Calgary, Canada |