

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORR_105133
Title of the Manuscript:	Functional outcome of clavicular shaft fractures fixation by clavicular locking plate in adults
Type of the 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)
<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>Yes, the manuscript is well-written, and it focuses on an important scientific issue. The management of the fractures involving the clavicle is still debatable, and it is based on patient demands, the surgeon's preference, and the resources available.</p> <p>Yes, the title is suitable</p> <p>Yes, the abstract is comprehensive</p> <p>Yes,</p> <p>Yes, but it would be better if the author includes the pattern of the fracture in this study. We know that fracture patterns are not the same, as well as the healing time and management approach.</p> <p>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>The author used "better functional results", what did he compare it with? If they would have a different management plan, a better outcome may be expected but when you have only one option, it is wise to conclude or use a "Good functional outcome" rather than "a better functional outcome"</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:	Abdirizak Abdullahi Sheikdon
Department, University & Country	Royal Hospital, Somalia