

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORR_97358
Title of the Manuscript:	Adolescent hallux valgus
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The authors conducted a retrospective study concerning the Hallux valgus, foot deformity corresponding to the deviation of the first metatarsal in varus and the big toe in valgus, during 6 years. The study was performed on teenagers, average age 14. The choice of correction technique depends much more on the teams and experience. Analysing the deformity and the associated pathologies in order to determine the best surgical strategy. 2. The title is in accordance with the text. 3. The abstract of the article summarizes the text of the article. 4. The text is very good divided into parts. 5. The article is scientifically correct. 6. The references are updated. Tables and figures are in accordance with the text.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English is good.	
Optional/General comments	The article should be published in this form.	

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:	Alina Maria Sisu
Department, University & Country	Victor Babes University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Romania