

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORR_99587
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARISON OF FREQUENCY OF NON-UNION IN PATIENTS OF DISPLACED FRACTURE NECK OF FEMUR TREATED WITH DYNAMIC HIP SCREW VERSUS CANNULATED SCREW FIXATION
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. This article presents a valuable comparison between two fixation methods, dynamic hip screw and cannulated screw fixation, for the treatment of displaced femoral neck fractures in patients aged 20-50 years. The findings suggest that dynamic hip screw fixation has a lower non-union rate compared to cannulated screw fixation 2. The title is suitable 3. "Fracture was reduced under image intensifier" should be "Fracture was reduced under an image intensifier". 4. There are some English issues that require fixes. The structure is ok. 5. Yes. The methodology is ok. 6. References are ok	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. English is ok. The grammar and spelling issues require fixes	
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:	Tudor Sorin Pop
Department, University & Country	University of Medicine, Pharmacy, Science and Technology, Romania