

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_79002
Title of the Manuscript:	Triceps Reflection Versus Olecranon Osteotomy Approach in Supracondylar Intercondylar Distal Humeral Fractures Managed by Open Reduction and Internal Fixation in Adults
Type of the Article	Original 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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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	<b>Biggest problem is methodology – no data about duration of the surgery, blood loss, and difference in rehabilitation protocol How were the patients selected for one or other type of treatment ? If all the patients with C3 fractures were drafted for olecranon osteotomy, we can not compare these procedures because we selected it with intent</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Discussion must contain more references regarding approaches and complications. Only 7 references are not enough. Also, the paper would have more value with longer follow up period, or if only C3 fractures were analysed with different surgical approaches	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The structure of the paper is solid, statistics simple, but adequate. Unfortunately, the conclusion is not supported by the data (regarding age of the patient and preferred surgical approach) but subjective opinion.	

### 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nemanja Slavkovic
Department, University & Country	University of Belgrade, Serbia