

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_101671
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Results of Separate Vertical Wirings for the Treatment of Extra-Articular Fractures of the Distal Pole of the Patella.
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.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is important to the scientific community. The title is suitable. The abstract is comprehensive but needs some adjustments. The structure is appropriate. The manuscript is scientifically correct. The reference are ok.</p> <p>The paper addresses an exciting subject.. I express my sincere gratitude for the opportunity to review your manuscript. The effort of the author is appreciated. After assessing the manuscript, the following issues raised my concern:</p> <p>Structures like the following: "Men's risk is double women's" from the abstract should not be used.</p> <p>"NITOR took in 185 people with closed patella fractures. 52 patients had patellar fractures." - unfortunately the information is misleading.</p> <p>As a personal opinion, the abstract is too telegraphic.</p> <p>Are there also available some preop and postop radiographic assessments?</p> <p>Please assess the manuscripts for typing mistakes.</p> <p>Figures 4 and 7 are not pie diagrams. They are bar charts.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Needs some adjustments.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Rares Mircea Birlutiu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Foisor Clinical Hospital of Orthopedics, Romania</b>