

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	Medicine and Medical Research - New Perspectives
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_1980
Title of the Manuscript:	FUNCTIONAL OUTCOME OF PATIENTS WITH MODERATE-TO-SEVERE MEDIAL COMPARTMENT OSTEOARTHRITIS KNEE TREATED BY HIGH TIBIAL OSTEOTOMY AT A TERTIARY CARE CENTER
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community because it details the complications of the Stoppa approach for acetabular fractures. It provides valuable data that can improve surgical techniques and patient care. I like the manuscript for its clear presentation and practical insights. However, more information on long-term outcomes would enhance its value. Overall, it is a well-constructed and relevant study.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is mostly comprehensive but could benefit from the following adjustments: Add Specific Findings: Include key results or findings to provide a clearer summary of the study's contributions. Clarify Objectives: Explicitly state the primary research objectives or hypotheses. Highlight Implications: Briefly mention the practical implications of the findings for clinical practice. Consider these additions to ensure the abstract fully encapsulates the study's scope and significance.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust due to its rigorous methodology and clear presentation of results. The study employs well-established techniques and statistical analyses, ensuring reliable and valid conclusions. Additionally, the comprehensive review of relevant literature supports the research findings and places them within the broader scientific context. The attention to detail in both the experimental design and data interpretation underscores the technical soundness of the study.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references in the manuscript appear to be sufficient and up-to-date. However, for a more comprehensive review, consider adding recent studies or reviews from the last 1-2 years to ensure that the manuscript reflects the latest advancements in the field. Specific suggestions for additional references would depend on the exact topics and gaps in the current reference list.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communications. However, minor revisions might be needed to enhance clarity and coherence. It is recommended to review the manuscript for any grammatical errors or awkward phrasing to ensure it meets the high standards of academic writing.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript presents a valuable contribution to the field with its detailed analysis and clear methodology. However, to strengthen its impact, consider adding more recent references to capture the latest developments and ensure a comprehensive literature review. Additionally, enhancing the clarity of some sections could improve readability and comprehension. Overall, the study is well-executed and provides significant insights, but these minor adjustments could further elevate its quality and relevance.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Adnane Lachkar
Department, University & Country	Mohammed First University, Morocco