

REVIEWER 1

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1 Title reflects the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript. 2 Abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript. 3 The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript, 4 The manuscript adequately describes the background, present status and significance of the study. 5 The manuscript describes methods in adequate detail. 6 The research objectives are achieved by the experiments used in this study? The authors demonstrate using x-ray to determine the size of posterior malleola fracture. 7 The manuscript interprets the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically and the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner, The discussion is accurate and it discusses the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? 8 The figures, diagrams, and tables are sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative, with labeling of figures using arrows, asterisks, etc, and are the legends adequate and accurately reflective of the images/illustrations shown? 9 No further biostatistician review needed 10 The authors used % when describing length shouldn't it be mm? 11 The manuscript appropriately cites the latest, important and authoritative references in the Introduction and Discussion sections? 12 The manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? 13 Authors have prepared their manuscripts according to BPG's standards for manuscript type and the appropriate topically-relevant category, as follows: CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. For (6) Letters to the Editor, the author(s) should have prepared the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting. Letters to the Editor will be critically evaluated and only letters with new important original or complementary information should be considered for publication. A Letter to the Editor that only recapitulates information published in the article(s) and states that more studies are needed is not acceptable? 14 Ethics statements. The manuscript met the requirements of ethics, A well written manuscript]t minor discretionary review suggested and in one instance the abbreviation for posterior malleolus was rendered MP instead of PM. also the use of on x-ray or CT may be better but that is a suggestion. Find attached for your perusal

REVIEWER 2

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, I had the opportunity to review your manuscript. Thanks for your effort, and I hope that my comments help improving your manuscript quality. -I would like the authors to add some recommendations at the end of the manuscript, do you suggest that

CT scan must be obtained in each case, or on selective basis? -The title must be modified, should it be "tomography" or "computed tomography" and please add the type of the study in the title. -Third paragraph in the introduction, it should be "PM" not "MP" -In the methods section, the authors mentioned the following "In sagittal CT slices (SAGCT), the image with the largest PM was selected," why did not the author choose a fixed point for measurements? who decide on teh biggest fragment? -Why did not the authors consider the amount of displacemnt as well as the amount of comminution, which will be easily assessed in the CT images rather than the plain x-rays?