



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORR_46629
Title of the Manuscript:	Cannulated Cancellous Screw and Ender's Nail Fixation in Stable Intertrochanteric Femur Fracture in Elderly Patient With Co-Morbid Condition
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	<p>Title: OK</p> <p>Abstract: Please do not use abbreviations at the abstract section. It is better to giving the measurement methods briefly at the methodology.</p> <p>Keywords: OK</p> <p>Introduction: You could combine the second and third sentences. Because they all have same meanings. The sentence 'The treatment of intertrochanteric fractures evolves...' needs references. Please give the aim of the study at the end of this section.</p> <p>Materials and methods: If it is a prospective study please local ethics committee. I think that you should give the reference of the Harris Hip score. The statistical method have to be given.</p> <p>Obsevation and analyses: It is better to give SD with mean age.</p> <p>Discussion: Very very short. Have to be re-written.</p> <p>Conclusion: Second paragraph could be placed at the discussion section.</p> <p>References: There are a lot of mistakes. They have to be corrected.</p> <p>Figures: There are problems with numbers of figures. Please correct.</p> <p>Graph: Is it true '5000%'</p>	<p>Abstract has been corrected</p> <p>Introduction section has been modified</p> <p>Material and method section has been restructured</p> <p>Discussion illustrated</p> <p>References has been upgraded and effected in the manuscript</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>It was written in a rather sloppy.</p> <p>Major revision is needed.</p>	Thank you

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)	