

SDI Review Form 1.6

SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org



Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_35079
Title of the Manuscript:	INTRAMEDULLARY INTERLOCKING NAILING FOR LONG BONE FRACTURES OF THE LOWER LIMB: OUR EXPERIENCE WITH FREE-HAND LOCKING
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/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 author will need to address some his/her comments open fractures line item 38-41. Line items 46-48 need revision why does this author consider the locking screw to be the most challenging part of the procedure. Line item 52-53 the author should clarify and elaborate on the aim of the study. Line item 63-64 the author stated the same team, does that include the surgeon and OR staff each time? The author also states the operative time decreased, this section should have a table to indicate the exact OR time for each patient. Line item 65-77 the author should explain why all the femoral procedures were done retrograde, there is no clear reason why. IN the discussion the author should comment on the objective of the study and did the results prove or disprove. The is not a clear thought process in the discussion, the author seems to drift into other studies regarding open fracture which is not the aim of the study in my opinion.

Minor REVISION comments

Optional/General comments

Overall a reasonable start but this paper requires significant revision prior to publication

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Ashley Simela</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University Hospitals, Richmond Medical Center, Cleveland, OH, USA</i>