

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORR_79545
Title of the Manuscript:	Orthopaedic OPD clinic changed during COVID-19 with Teleconsultation presenting The Good, the Bad and the Ugly aspects: Perspective from a developing country
Type of the Article	Commentary
<b>Submission date of Review comments</b>	<b>14 January, 2022</b>

### General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajorr.com/index.php/AJORR/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are numerous "<b>Grammatical</b>" mistakes, so, corrections and language editing are obligatory (<b>Major</b>).</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The "<b>Title</b>" is unsuitable and incorrect. So, it is more suitable to change it to "<b>Orthopedic Outpatient Clinic Versus Teleconsultation during COVID-19; Cons and Prons: A viewpoint in A developing Country</b>" (<b>Minor</b>).</li> <li>The author didn't better use criticism for advantages and disadvantages in the "<b>Abstract</b>" and the "<b>text</b>". You should use the method of a point versus point regarding cons and prons in both orthopedic outpatient clinics and teleconsultation (<b>Minor</b>).</li> <li>Regrettably, in the "<b>Introduction and Discussion</b>"; the author can't distinguishable between the original data and the author's perspective or anecdotal evidence to support the argument. Why? (<b>Minor</b>).</li> <li>Regarding the capitalization of all letters in the subheadings is unsuitable, please, change it (<b>Minor</b>).</li> <li>Indeed, in the "<b>Conclusion</b>"; the author more focused on the virtual OPD neglecting the traditional OPD. Why?!!!! (<b>Minor</b>).</li> <li>There are some "<b>References</b>" that were indexed but the indexing of the remaining "References" was neglected. Please, review and add the defective indexing (<b>Minor</b>).</li> <li>Unfortunately, the article is too long. Commentary is usually a very short article of around 1000-1500 words. Please, summarize it (<b>Minor</b>).</li> <li>The author did not refer to the targeted recent focus article for commentary. So, it might be difficult for us to provide an exact outline of how to proceed (<b>Major</b>).</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	-	

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Yasser Mohammed Hassanain Elsayed</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Egypt</b>