



SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>1) Manuscript presents a very important topic with major limitations at every step throughout the study: Defining criteria for inclusion and exclusion of the subjects in the study poorly introduced, also execution of the SF12 and the HRQOL has not been to scientific details important for the topic of interest.</p> <p>2) There are major newer publications that are similar with presentation as a quality of life assessment that assess all these parameters, and although we appreciate the authors present the same topic with less number of cases, this study has major drawbacks in lacking points to prove the differences in the developing countries versus developed countries (If that was one of the main goals of the authors) We recommend that the study need to have proper scientific details to be considered in this category: Please refer to the one that the authors have already cited :(Amarilla-Donoso FJ, López-Espuela F, Roncero-Martín R, Leal-Hernandez O, Puerto-Parejo LM, Aliaga-Vera I, Toribio-Felipe R, Lavado-García JM. Quality of life in elderly people after a hip fracture: a prospective study. Health Qual Life Outcomes. 2020 Mar 14;18(1):71.)</p> <p>3) NOTE: NOT BEING REJECTED DUE TO LACK OF NOVELTY BUT DUE TO NO RELEVANCE IN THE DATA COLLECTED, ASSESSED AND FINAL RESULTS TO THE FINAL DISCUSSION: Hence can be restudied and re-written with proper scientific techniques to re-submit if need to consider as an original scientific article. For eg the recent article presents the outcome at 3 months as otherwise(poor outcome) Chiang MH, Huang YY, Kuo YJ, Huang SW, Jang YC, Chu FL, Chen YP. Prognostic Factors for Mortality, Activity of Daily Living, and Quality of Life in Taiwanese Older Patients within 1 Year Following Hip Fracture Surgery. J Pers Med. 2022 Jan 13;12(1):102. doi: 10.3390/jpm12010102. PMID: 35055417;</p> <p>4) The current manuscript also needs major and minor grammatical errors, which have been sent as comments as well as highlighted in green and color coded. These will need major re-write and proper derivation of the statistical methods to prove how the Q values are in correlation to the current Conclusion which seems to be invalid. As this may be due to multiple factors the overall discussion and conclusion does not have scientific flow to deliver the message to the readers.</p> <p>5) The manuscript also lacks the standard scientific format required by WJOR and highlights in blue and red have been quoted with remarks to authors to improve the quality of the manuscript. This will also need an overhaul to reproduced systematically.</p> <p>6. Tabular segregation of NOF, in addition to RNOF, LNOF has not been clearly defined by authors leading to confusion and losing the strength of the statistical application, which has been applied without scientific discussion how the current study proves a particular intervention enabled better or similar outcome in the 3- and 6-month period: as a result the final discussion does not seem to be relevant to the current study in any one criteria. This weakens the manuscript as an Original article</p>	<p>Yes. The inclusion and exclusion criteria is added.</p> <p>Yes I understand your feedback. But the study has been completed in 2019 and it is difficult to follow the patients. I consider your points and implicate in future.</p> <p>I understand the points, but it is difficult to do the new study at this epidemic scenario.</p> <p>Yes the grammatical errors have been corrected.</p> <p>The standard guidelines as per journal format has been done.</p> <p>We are unable to collect the data apart from RNOF and LNOF.</p>