

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORR_106342
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Distally Based Sural Fasciocutaneous Flap in the Management of Foot, Ankle, and Lower Third of the Leg Soft Tissue Defects: A Retrospective Study in The National Burn Center and Plastic Surgery of Morocco</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community? No problem</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable? No problem</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? No problem</b></p> <p>3. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Good enough</b></p> <p>4. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Good enough</b></p> <p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? It is necessary to additionally describe the thesis discussion and add references to it. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>English language and style Moderate English changes required.</p> <p>Check the correct reference format according to the author guidelines of this journal.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>This study suggested very interesting results and experimental suggestions.</b></p> <p><b>Also, this paper is well written with logical flow.</b></p> <p><b>However, I found some minor limitations and suggest revision related these issues.</b></p> <p><b>This paper deserves to be published after minor revisions. It is necessary to additionally describe the thesis discussion and add references to it.</b></p>	

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jung, Jin-Hwa
Department, University & Country	Semyung University, Republic of Korea