

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_79738
Title of the Manuscript:	PERTROCHANTERIC FRACTURE NECK OF THE FEMUR PRESENTING AS AVASCULAR NECROSIS WITH GAIT ABNORMALITY - A CASE REPORT.
Type of the Article	Case report

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>)

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>Congrats on the idea, interesting work, please see my comments:</p> <p>1# Introduction is written too vaguely, add description of epidemiology, etiology of pertrochanteric fracture neck of the femur . Add a description of treatment options. Add information about costs associated with treatment.</p> <p>2# CASE REPORT: Add more information about the patient, whether he had comorbidities, his BMI, his occupation. Add a prior history of his treatment if he has been previously treated.</p> <p>3#In the text you use references such as figure 1 and in the pictures you use image 1. Standardize vocabulary.</p> <p>4# In the text I received the two tables overlap. Please correct. Add a title for the second table.</p> <p>5# "The writers have gathered and saved documented ethical approval in accordance with international or university standards." - What do you mean by this? Lots of generalities. What standards? Cite specific institutions.</p> <p>6# " The writers have obtained and saved written consent in accordance with international or university standards." - Same questions as in comment #5. The authors did not have bioethics committee approval for the patient description. So they don't refer to the bioethics committee. The Declaration of Helsinki suggests informed patient consent. Are you writing about her? Did the patient know his case would be seeded? Did he give informed consent? Did he know that he could opt out of his case report?</p> <p>7# - The bibliography is written in a variety of citation styles. The literature is outdated. Suggests adding current items.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	not applicable	
Optional/General comments	not applicable	

Review Form 1.6

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:	Grzegorz Zieliński
Department, University & Country	Medical University of Lublin, Poland