



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORR_67888
Title of the Manuscript:	TREATMENT OF FRACTURE OF DISTAL 1/3 FEMUR WITH RETROGRADE MULTIDIRECTIONAL INTRAMEDULLARY INTERLOCKING NAIL 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy> )



SDI 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>-on the abstract section there are some points you included on the conclusion that were not mentioned on the result summary including blood loss and infection, operative time, exposure to c-arm radiations, weight bearing and decreased overall complications ,In my opinion it will e good to include those points summarised in your results section.</p> <p>-you raised a very good point on how reduction is difficult in reducing these fractures and the importance of respecting t he soft tissue ,it will be very use full to add any methods of reduction and soft tissue handling method you used on the methodology section</p> <p>-on material s and methods ,you have initially mentioned the study includes patients above the age of 20 years old so it would be better to not include that under exclusion criteria as ,patients below 20 years old, exclusion criteria is used to exclude patients who were initially considered to be included ,for other reasons</p> <p>-It would be worthwhile to include the Mean Modified Knee Rating Scale Score as it helps your readers get a better understanding of your outcome measures</p> <p>-I see you have one patient with non-union,i was it would be usefull addition to your manuscript to add the possible causes for the non-union and what has been done for the patient</p> <p>-in order to have a better understanding of where your fixations and patient outcomes are compared to other care givers it is important to include some reviews of papers done on outcomes of distal femur fractures fixed with retrograde nailing</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>-as you are considering intra op blood loss and invasiveness of the surgery ,as one outcome, may be you can include the average blood loss and surgical time</p> <p>-it is good to have a mention of conflict of interest at the end of your conclusion and acknowledgment as well</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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:	<b>Bezawit Teferi Tsegaye</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Addis Ababa Univeristy, Ethiopia</b>