



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_60590
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Bilateral Transolecranon fracture dislocation elbow with bilateral coronoid and radial head fractures – a rare complex elbow injury. A case report and review of literature.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Case report</b>

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p><b>Keywords</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I suggest MESH keywords</li> </ul> <p><b>Introduction:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I suggest to update the reference 1 with a more recent reference about the incidence or prevalence of this type of fracture.</li> <li>- I suggest to modify "We would like to report" in "we reported"</li> <li>- I suggest to add in the last line of introduction "we described the management and the functional results of..."</li> <li>- In the last line of the introduction, I suggest to the Authors to clarify the aim of the description of this case report and the novelty of their literature review. The authors declared that they "were unable to find such injuries" in the current literatures, they could explain what topics they found, what differences were present between their case report and other studies.</li> </ul> <p><b>Case Report</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It could be interesting to know the modality of the falls and assess the levers on the basis of the fractures</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I suggest to contextualize the topic of the case report and insert the importance of the description of this case report also within the review of the literature at the at the beginning of the discussion</li> <li>- In the first line of the discussion, add the reference: Newman et al.</li> <li>- I suggest to describe more in details the "the terrible triad"</li> <li>- About the incidence of fracture of coronoid that "involve more than 50% of the height of the coronoid", insert the reference</li> <li>- About "we positioned the patient in lateral position" specify where or when... during the surgery I suppose</li> <li>- At the end of the discussion I suggest to add the recovery of the range of motion (ROM) and of the strength at the end of the surgery (MRC for example or dynamometer measure), after rehabilitation and during the follow up</li> </ul> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The authors concluded that rehabilitation "gave good results". The Authors did not report any details about rehabilitation in the case report, but only in the conclusion. I propose to describe the rehabilitation program, the duration of this treatment, and the outcomes in the case report. The athirst could report the rehabilitative exercises for similar topic in the systematic review.</li> </ul> <p><b>Limits</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I suggest to add an eventual new paragraph about the limits of the study, especially about the literature review.</li> </ul> <p><b>References</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I suggest to clarify the references according the guidelines of the Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research. After the name of the authors, the name of the journal should be abbreviated, then the year of publication, the number and the pages of the journal. If it is possible the DOI could be introduced at the end.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p>		



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments		
---------------------------	--	--

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>Rita Chiaramonte</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Catania, Italy</b>