

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77856
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Rehabilitation in a complex case of Intertrochanteric fracture in geriatric – A Case Report
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:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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>The study is about “Impact of Rehabilitation in a complex case...”</p> <p>1. In conclusion the impact is to be clearly mentioned prior to any recommendation</p> <p>2. This impact has to be compared with earlier reported cases in which no such rehabilitation is carried out in similar matched cases</p> <p>3. The complexity of the case to be highlighted or else the word “complex” to be deleted</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. Unnecessary information not relevant to this case to be deleted e.g. “The study enrolled a total of 186 cases, with 115 men and 71 women participating. In all cases, surgical procedures were carried out, and a Gamma 3 intramedullary nail was placed in the medullary cavity (7). Surgical site infection (SSI) is a difficult complication after intertrochanteric fracture surgery, but there has been no large sample size study to investigate its incidence and risk factors. The purpose of this study was to look into the occurrence and risk factors of SSI after intertrochanteric fracture surgery. A total of 1941 patients who underwent intertrochanteric fracture surgery between October 2014 and December 2018 were included in the study. Demographic information, surgical variables, and preoperative laboratory indexes were obtained from a prospective database and compared to hospital records. The optimal cutoff value for quantitative data was discovered using receiver operating characteristic analysis. To analyses the risk factors, univariate and multivariable analyses were performed. In total, 25 patients (1.3%) developed SSI, with 22 (1.1%) developing superficial infection and 3 (0.2%) developing deep infection. Gender (odds ratio 2.64, P =.024), time to surgery>4 days (OR 2.41, P =.046), implant (intramedullary or extramedullary devices) (OR 2.96, P =.036), and ALB35 g/L (OR 2.88, P =.031) remained significant factors after multiple variables were adjusted. Finally, the incidence of SSI after intertrochanteric fracture surgery was 1.3 percent, with 1.1 percent for superficial infection and 0.2 percent for deep infection. Gender, surgery time >4 days, implant (intramedullary or extramedullary devices), and ALB<35 g/L were independent risk factors for the rate of SSI (8)”.</p> <p>2. In the tables where knee ranges are mentioned, they should be mentioned as 0-30 degrees which is self explanatory. No need to mention flexion and extension range of movement separate.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>I strongly encourage to seek help of english language expert to rewmanuscript in a clear, correct and unambiguous language. Some examples of parts to be rewritten “Impact of Rehabilitation in a complex case of Intertrochanteric fracin geriatric” “X ray was done and diagnose with two part displaced intertrochantfemur fracture.” “Extra capsular proximal femur fracture is the most common in eldeand the management</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	depends upon the ambulatory status of the individual. The non-operative management is the first choice only wthe patient is non ambulatory or is at a high risk of pre operatively”	
--	---	--

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:	Vijay Panchanadikar
Department, University & Country	Deenanath Mangeshkar Hospital, India