

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORR_105552
Title of the Manuscript:	Relevance of the clinical and laboratory profile in decision-making for patients with septic arthritis
Type of the Article	Original Research Article Case Study or Report

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, it is.</p> <p>Suitable.</p> <p>Yes, it is. No, as per the Journal author guidelines, the text, excluding the abstract, if required, can be divided into numbered sections with brief headings. Starting from introduction with section 1. subsections should be numbered (for example 2.1 (then 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2, etc.), up to three levels.</p> <p>Yes. Yes. 1. As per the Journal guidelines, this belongs to the article type as "Case Study or Case Report". 2. Immediately after the abstract, about 4-8 keywords should be given. 3. Non-standard abbreviations should be listed, and the full form of each abbreviation should be given in parentheses at first use in the text. 4. Consent, Ethical approval details were recommended to provide. 5. Carefully read the article and correct the spelling mistakes found wherever applicable. 6. Ethical approval details to be provided in the article.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, to be improved.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Balaji Nagarajan
Department, University & Country	United States of America