



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORR_52502
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARISON OF FUNCTIONAL OUTCOME OF BOXERS FRACTURE TREATED WITH ANTEGRADE PREBENT K WIRE AND THOSE TREATED CONSERVATIVELY
Type of the Article	Case study

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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	The introduction is flawed, the methodology is poor and several statements are not supported by results; besides, the outcomes measures (Total Active Movements and neck shaft angle) should be better explained. The Authors state that "there was no significant difference in TAM (Total Active Movement) of affected and unaffected hand in patients treated with antegrade k wire technique"; what does "significant" mean? No information about a statistical comparison are given.	
Minor REVISION comments	The overall structure of the paper is not line with the current outline of scientific manuscripts. Particularly, there is improper repartitions of paragraphs and of their contents: e.g. the statement at lines 121-124 belongs to "Material and Methods" and not to "Results".	
Optional/General comments	The first image has no number and caption (line 39-40), the others are not mentioned in the text. In the text there are several acronyms without full explanation (MCP, DIP, PIP).	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Diana Cassi
Department, University & Country	University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Italy