

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORR_88822
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A prospective study of four-part intertrochanteric femur fractures treated with cemented bipolar prostheses in elderly patients</b>
Type of the 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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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	<p>It is a great topic that deserves to be studied well. Congratulations for choosing a good topic for research.</p> <p>However, there are changes that needs to be done before it is considered for publication.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As the study has been completed already, the manuscript should not have any text in future tense. (e.g. 'the study WILL BE conducted' becomes incorrect in a completed study)</li> <li>2. Final number of patients included in the study has not been mentioned in the results. A reader might have to add up all the numbers to understand total number of participants in the study.</li> <li>3. In results, it is mentioned that on 3.9<sup>th</sup> day, the patient was fully weight bearing. Is this the MEAN duration of weight bearing from all patients? If yes, then this is supposed to be mentioned in that way. (for your reference, you can mention- "In this Study, mean duration of hospital stay was 8.5 days" instead of writing "the patient stayed in hospital for 8.5 days)</li> <li>4. Follow up duration was upto 1 year as mentioned in the manuscript. Did all patients came for follow up till one year? None of the patients lost in follow up?</li> <li>5. Conclusions should be drawn based on the study and facts and not based on what the author 'FEELS'. (Refer to the first line in the conclusion).</li> <li>6. To conclude that bipolar is the 'BEST' option, the study needs to have compared all the options. However, since it is not a comparative study, the conclusion that one procedure is better (or in this study, the best), becomes questionable.</li> <li>7. 15 out of 18 references are very old that is from 1970s-1990s. Such old references for a study in 2022 doesn't sound considerable. References from newer articles are recommended. Although, older papers can be used, but not in majority. It is not a review paper.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lots of grammatical errors in the manuscript that needs revision.</li> <li>2. Better manuscript writing recommended</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Comparison with other surgical procedures in practice for similar fractures like Intramedullary nails to conclude what the author is trying to conclude.	

**PART 2:**

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

**Review Form 1.6**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Amit B. Garud</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Dr. D Y Patil School of Medicine, India</b>