

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_110974
Title of the Manuscript:	Open enucleation of the talus : a case report
Type of the Article	Case report

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This manuscript reports a rare case of open enucleation of the talus and discusses its surgical treatment. While the case is uncommon, the scientific community may find it relevant due to the rarity of this traumatic injury. However, the importance could be enhanced by providing a more detailed discussion of the clinical implications, challenges in treatment, and potential advancements in managing such cases. 2. The title is generally suitable, as it accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. However, it could be made more specific by including information about the surgical approach, such as "Surgical Management of Open Enucleation of the Talus: A Case Report." 3. The abstract provides a concise overview of the case, but it could be more comprehensive. It lacks information about the surgical techniques employed and the follow-up outcomes. Adding details on the surgical approach, postoperative care, and patient recovery would enhance the abstract's completeness 4. The subsections and structure are generally appropriate. However, adding a "Materials and Methods" section detailing the surgical procedure, as well as a more detailed "Discussion" section covering the clinical implications, potential complications, and future directions, would improve the manuscript's organization. 5. The scientific content appears to be correct based on the information provided. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Can you elaborate on the term "scapho talar pins"? Is it synonymous with the naviculo-talar pin? (ii) Regarding the statement, "functional result was satisfactory at the last follow-up, with no signs of radiological necrosis," could you specify when the last follow-up took place? (iii) Did you obtain X-rays after the removal of the K-wires, or did rehabilitation commence with the K-wires in place? (iv) During the follow-up X-rays, did you observe Hawkins sign? Additionally, could you provide information on the location of the key X-ray indicating revascularization in the talus? 7. The references are adequate but could be expanded to include more recent studies on talus injuries, conservative surgical approaches, and outcomes. Including references from the past ten years would ensure the inclusion of the latest advancements in the field. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language and English quality are generally acceptable, but some sentences could be rephrased for clarity. Additionally, check for consistency in terminology and ensure that the manuscript follows a standardized scientific writing style.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider adding figures or images to illustrate the surgical procedure, preoperative and postoperative images, and X-rays for better visualization and understanding. • The manuscript lacks a conclusion section. Including a conclusion summarizing key findings and their implications would provide a better sense of closure. 	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rahul S Thokaloath
Department, University & Country	Kerala University of Health Sciences, Government Medical College, India