

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

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 1.7

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>1. This manuscript has an interesting topic and potential to be published in AJORR. It has an urgency for scientific community.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. Yes, but it needs to be shortened to maximum 300 words.</p> <p>4. Yes.</p> <p>5. Yes.</p> <p>6. Yes.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Dear author</p> <p>I highly appreciate your hard work on this manuscript, but I have a few remarks:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Brief your abstract to maximum 300 words from introduction to conclusion. 2. Provide 3-5 keywords according to MeSH Terms. 3. Enrich your introduction by add more references. 4. This statement "For categorical variables, the unpaired t-test or Mann-Whitney test was used to examine differences between the two groups; for continuous variables, the Mann-Whitney test or Chi-square test was employed, depending on normality." are interchanged. Categorical variables usually tested using Chi-square, while for continuous or numeric variables are using independent t-test. 5. Add the normality and homogeneity test to decide parametric or non-parametric test. 6. Add conclusion section after discussion. 7. For journal references use the last 5-10 years. <p>Hope it helps to improve the manuscript's quality.</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:	Krisna Yuarno Phatama
Department, University & Country	Universitas Brawijaya, Indonesia