

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORR_111164
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysing the Rate of Lower Limb Bone Fractures and Repair among Men and Women in Three Tertiary Health Institutions of Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Article

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><u>Compulsory</u> 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. The manuscript may be important scientifically. But I feel the age wise breakdown of the studied data would have been more appropriate. In fact, I feel it is inappropriate not to analyze the data as per suitable age intervals. 2. Not really. Use of the terms 'men' and 'women' make the title appear a bit odd from a scientific and may be medical point of view. These two above mentioned words may be replaced by 'adults'. And replacing the term '3 tertiary health institutions' with 'tertiary health institutions of the particular area of Nigeria studied' will make the title more scientific. As far as the alternative title is concerned your guess is as good as mine. I think it should be totally revamped. 3. Abstract is comprehensive. But the number of 'key words' must be restricted to '3-6' and they should be appropriate. 4. Subsections are appropriate. Structure is alright. 5. Well, the manuscript definitely lags behind in its scientific aspect. The whole hospital records are available to the researchers. But they have not divided the study population into appropriate age groups which is absolutely necessary for such type of study. And it is not indicated in the study if the patients who underwent fracture treatment had any comorbidities that could interfere with fracture healing. Even the 'inclusion' or 'exclusion' criteria of the persons selected for the study are not mentioned. Statistical analysis is grossly inadequate. Nothing in detail is mentioned about the statistical criteria used to determine the sample size. Again giving only 'percentage' as a statistical parameter without any 'p values' and other statistically methods to analyze the data makes the so called 'stastical analysis' out of date in this age of statistical extravaganza. 6. I think references are alright. May be, the authors could have used references belonging to the years 2021-2023. But the references may be considered adequate. Additional Comments- What I feel as a reviewer, this article is not very appropriate scientifically, statistics wise and logically. Age wise breakdown of the study population and a proper inclusion/exclusion criteria are two definite requirements of any scientific study involving the studied topic. These are my heart-felt comments. The authors or the editorial board of your esteemed journal or any other esteemed reviewer may differ with me. I will definitely welcome that. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language\English quality is alright and definitely acceptable.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The treatment of the topic leaves a lot to be desired. I am not aware of the facilities or inadequacies experienced by the authors while conducting the study. But this article needs to be modified greatly in order to pass as a 'scientific work'. Any inconveniences caused to anyone by such comments of mine are hereby sincerely regretted. At the same time I appreciate the efforts put in by the authors in conducting the research work and preparing the manuscript. But I am really disappointed with the unscientific treatment of the topic covered.</p>	

[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:	Gyanaranjan Nayak
Department, University & Country	IMS and SUM Hospital, Siksha 'O' Anusandhan Deemed to be University, India