

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORR_96701
Title of the Manuscript:	The Prevalence of Postoperative Wound Infection in Orthopedic Surgery at Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujib Medical College (BSMMC), Faridpur, Bangladesh.
Type of the Article	Original 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)	To some extend. Yes. Yes. 1. There are few inaccuracies in the presentation of results which are highlighted. These need appropriate correction and modification. 2. The discussion, conclusion and recommendation should be centred around the results of a study. The discussion, conclusion and recommendation are totally away from the results of the study. The prevalence of SSI is not at all mentioned in the conclusion. The discussion about clean wound, operative room occupants, NNIS do not find in the results of the study. The results of this study and discussion are divergent. This need major revision.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Fair.	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Purushothaman Padmanabhan
Department, University & Country	Meenakshi Medical College Hospital, India