

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	Retrospective chort study

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.	This technique of tibia nailing currently recommended in proximal tibia fractures. So this study will be beneficial for scientific literature	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Alternative title: "Revolutionizing Treatment of Proximal Third Tibia Fractures: Clinical and Radiological Outcomes of Supra-Patellar Intramedullary Nailing"	
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.	It's good, correct spelling mistakes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	References are less, discussion needs more references	
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.	This study uses 3 different outcome measurement ways. Vas .lyshlom and rust. Sample size is small	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, need more references	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes, minor changes are required in discussions and abstract	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tajuddin Chitapure
Department, University & Country	MGM School of physiotherapy, MGMIHS, India