

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 84616

Title: Clinical outcome of open ankle fractures in patients above 70 years of age

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06137947

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-26

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-26 22:54

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-26 23:31

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I think this article has some challenges: 1- The sample size is very small and cannot be a criterion for judgment 2- Entry and exit criteria are not considered in this study 3- Many confounding factors such as gender, underlying diseases, lifestyle (smoking, Alcohol,), and metabolic diseases can affect the clinical outcome.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 84616

Title: Clinical outcome of open ankle fractures in patients above 70 years of age

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03809896

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-26

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-05-17 07:28

Reviewer performed review: 2023-05-23 08:18

Review time: 6 Days

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I think the topic of study is interesting. However, I suggest that authors consider the following points: 1. I suggest authors add a list of abbreviations at the end of the manuscript. 2. Throughout the manuscript, the titles of tables should be at the top. 3. The Introduction section is poorly written. The authors should explain more about fractures, especially ankle fractures.