



**J. K. Press**

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Journal of Case Reports in Medical Science</a>           |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_JOCRIMS_12628</b>  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Surgical treatment of tibial pilon fractures : About 54 cases</b> |
| Type of the Article      | <u>Original Research Article</u>                                     |



## **PART 1: Review Comments**

|   | Reviewer's comment  | <b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i> |
|---|---|---|
| <p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li><li><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</li><li><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li><li><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li><li><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li><li><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li></ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>1. It does not provide much benefit to the scientific community.</b></li><li><b>2. Unfortunately, the title of the article is not appropriate.</b><br/>The title may be as follows: "Our surgical treatment results in tibia pilon fractures"</li><li><b>3. Unfortunately, the references are out of date. The most recent reference is from 2012. There is confusion in the references. The text formats are different from each other.</b></li></ol> |   |



|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments   |  |  |
| 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | 1. It is suitable.   |  |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments   | <p>I thank the authors for their efforts, but there are some points I would like to point out.<br/>It is stated as 54 cases in the title, but 32 cases are explained in the article. The patients and method section is quite weak. How many patients included? What are the inclusion and exclusion criteria? How many patients receive open surgery? How many patients underwent external fixator? should be specified. The location of tables and figures is not specified in the paragraph. The result in the abstract and the result at the end of the article are not compatible with each other. The discussion was like a review. Authors should compare their findings with the literature.</p> |  |

## **2: Ethical issues**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Since it is a retrospective study, IRB is sufficient. IRB receipt must be stated in the article.</p> |
|--|---|

## **Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |                                   |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Name:                            | Murat Çakar                       |
| Department, University & Country | Health Science University, Turkey |