

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORR_86564
Title of the Manuscript:	To Evaluate The Safety of Early Weight Bearing Following Fixation of Displaced Bimalleolar Ankle Fractures
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

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>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>In this interesting article authors investigated how early weight-bearing will influence bone healing after bimalleolar ankle fracture and ORIF surgical treatment. However, manuscript is poorly written missing a lot of important data and needs major corrections.</p> <p>Abstract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - References should be avoided - Introduction section too long - Materials and methods are missing no. of patients - Results are not mentioned - Conclusion should be short without results and references from other studies <p>Material and methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Which radiographic projections were used to assess ankle status - Were they done with patient standing cause this could influence the size of medial clear space? - Statistical methods are missing used in this study - There is no corresponding text to figures in materials and methods section - What was the duration of the study? - Please list other parameters used in this study (e.g. return to work, pain intensity, and hospital stay) <p>Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lauge & Hansen classification was used to describe the type of fracture. Authors state that 'Supination External rotation type (Lauge & Hansen Type) fracture was common than other types of fracture' (page 6, line 5). What is the percentage of that fracture type and what was the percentage of other types? Was there statistically significant difference in fracture type between those two groups? - In table 2. They showed that it took longer for bone fracture to heal in group 2. Is there statistically significant difference? - 'In our study, no significant differences were found between the EWB and LWB groups with regard to any of the demographic variables listed in Table 1.'...please indicate p value - A lot of sentences (for example: 'These findings were in consensus with the findings from the study conducted by Egol et al, Ahl et al.[15,16]') should be listed in a discussion section. - MRI finding would be interesting since arthritic changes related to cartilage damage could be analysed. <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - First paragraph belongs to Result section - 'The above stated studies all suggest that earlier weight-bearing and motion would allow patients earlier return to function without any compelling disadvantage. Our findings show that earlier weight-bearing is associated with earlier return to full weight bearing without a reduction in functional outcome scores. [12,13,14]'...daily activities parameters should be listed 	
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maja Prutki
Department, University & Country	Clinical Hospital Centre Zagreb, School of Medicine University of Zagreb, Croatia