

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORR_127527
Title of the Manuscript:	Clinical and Radiological Outcomes of Proximal Third Tibia Fractures Treated with Supra patellar Intramedullary Nailing: Technical Insights and Study Results
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript addresses an important clinical concern regarding the management of proximal third tibia fractures. It provides valuable insights into the outcomes of suprapatellar intramedullary nailing, an emerging technique with advantages over conventional approaches. The focus on technical aspects for surgeons adds practical value. However, the inclusion of a comparative analysis with alternative techniques or a control group would strengthen its relevance to the scientific community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable and accurately reflects the content. However, consider rephrasing for better clarity, e.g., "Clinical and Radiological Outcomes of Suprapatellar Intramedullary Nailing in Proximal Third Tibia Fractures: Technical Insights and Results."	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract should specify the inclusion criteria used in the study and highlight the limitations (e.g., retrospective design, short-term follow-up). Grammatical improvements are needed for clarity and professional tone.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript structure is generally appropriate, but the following enhancements are recommended: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include a separate "Limitations" subsection within the discussion. • Clarify statistical analysis methods and provide details about software or techniques used. 	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is technically sound, with robust clinical data supporting its conclusions. However, more explicit mention of statistical methods used for data analysis is required. Additionally, further elaboration on the learning curve challenges and their clinical implications would enhance scientific depth.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are adequate and relevant, but a few recent studies on suprapatellar nailing techniques (published after 2020) could be included to improve comprehensiveness.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<input type="checkbox"/> Replace "Here we tend evaluate efficacy..." in the abstract with "This study evaluates the efficacy..." <input type="checkbox"/> Ensure uniform formatting of terms like "VAS score" and "Lysholm score."	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is a valuable contribution to orthopedic research. Future studies with a prospective design and larger sample sizes are encouraged to validate the findings.	

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:	Zubair Khalid
Department, University & Country	Ghurki Trust Teaching Hospital, Pakistan