

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_79245
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness and outcome of early weight bearing in ankle fracture. A systemic review
Type of the Article	Systematic Review

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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>Observation and comments</p> <p>Abstract Methods: authors must specify the inclusion criteria for the selected studies. They should also specify how they assessed the effectiveness and outcome of early weight bearing in ankle fracture in each study. Also, they must specify the types of study based on the number of studies included in this review.</p> <p>Text Methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quality assessment of data: Concerning this part, authors should describe the procedures and means such as The Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and Meta - Analysis (PRIMA) for reporting the methods, results, and discussion of this review. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) to assess the quality of the prospective and retrospective cohort studies, the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) checklist for the case reports and case series where applicable. They should also specify how they assessed the effectiveness and outcome of early weight bearing in ankle fracture in each study included in their review. - Statistical Analysis: authors should describe in detail the analysis plan and tools used for data analysis. <p>Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Literature selection: Concerning the 10 articles included in their review, the authors must specify the types of studies that these articles composed - Demographics: No demographic aspect emerges in this manuscript. For this purpose and regarding this part, the authors should at least summarize where the studies included in their review were conducted (for example: high, middle, and low-income countries in a mix of tertiary referral units and Hospitals). They should also describe the average age of the patients with confidence interval. <p>Competing interests: The author should describe whether there is a conflict of interest or not. If applicable, the author should describe and detail the nature of the interest</p> <p>Authors' contributions: The author should describe the role played by each co-author in the writing of this manuscript.</p> <p>In brief, it is an interesting systematic review on a relevant theme. The abstract is acceptable after a few minor revisions. Concerning the elements of appreciation, the title and the introduction are in consonant with the subject. The Methods and results require a major revisions.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>Abstract: the discussion part is not necessary in the abstract.</p> <p>Methods in the text: Inclusion criteria: In this type of study, first, eligibility must be assessed based on the title and abstract. Second, the full articles must be examined to determine inclusion suitability. In addition to what they have mentioned, the authors must therefore detail the inclusion criteria in taking into account the suggestion. Usually, the periods or dates do not enter in the inclusion criteria. The authors must therefore specify why the choice of articles published after 2006 constitutes an inclusion criteria in their study.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	Moreover, the authors must give the place and period of their study.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abdoul Salam DIARRA
Department, University & Country	National Institute for Training in Health Science of Mali / Annex of Mopti, Mali