

BPI Review Form 070520

Book Name:	Medicine and Medical Research - New Perspectives
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_1743
Title of the Manuscript:	ROLL OF LOCAL FLAP TECHNIQUE IN THE MANAGEMENT OF COMPOUND INJURIES OF LEG
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

BPI Review Form 070520

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(If agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors must write his/her feedback here)</i>
Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? Please write a few sentences explaining your answer	Yes This manuscript is important for the scientific community because: 1. It addresses a significant clinical challenge in managing compound leg injuries. 2. It evaluates practical local flap techniques for soft tissue coverage. 3. It provides evidence-based outcomes from 20 cases. 4. It emphasizes the role of orthopedic surgeons in reconstructive procedures. 5. It contributes to the field of limb salvage. These factors make it valuable for surgeons and researchers working on lower limb trauma and reconstruction.	
Is the title of the article suitable? Do you have any alternative Title in your mind?	The current title "ROLL OF LOCAL FLAP TECHNIQUE IN THE MANAGEMENT OF COMPOUND INJURIES OF LEG" is generally suitable, as it conveys the main topic of the study. However, there are a few issues: 1. There's a typo: "ROLL" should be "ROLE". 2. The title could be more specific and concise. Alternative titles could be: 1. "Local Flap Techniques for Soft Tissue Coverage in Compound Leg Injuries" 2. "Soft Tissue Reconstruction in Compound Leg Injuries: Outcomes of Local Flap Procedures" 3. "Local Flaps for Limb Salvage in Compound Leg Injuries: A Clinical Study"	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	The abstract is reasonably comprehensive, but it could be improved. Here are some suggestions: 1. Structure: While it follows a basic structure (Objective, Methods, Results, Conclusion), it could be more clearly organized with distinct sections. 2. Methods: - Include the specific number of each type of flap used (fasciocutaneous, muscle, musculocutaneous). - Mention the criteria for patient selection more clearly. - Include information on how results were evaluated. 3. Results: - Provide more specific data on outcomes for each flap type. - Include information on complications, if any. - Mention the average follow-up period. 4. Conclusion: - Be more specific about which flap types were most effective for different locations or types of injuries. - Include a brief statement on the implications of these findings for clinical practice. 5. Keywords: Add more relevant keywords to improve searchability.	

BPI Review Form 070520

	6. Overall clarity: Some sentences are long and could be simplified for better readability. 7. Statistical significance: If applicable, include information on the statistical significance of the results. A revised abstract addressing these points would provide a more comprehensive overview of the study.	
--	---	--

BPI Review Form 070520

Do you think the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	No, the English quality of the article is not entirely suitable for scholarly communications. While the content is understandable, there are several areas that need improvement: 1. Grammar and syntax: There are numerous grammatical errors and improper sentence structures throughout the text. 2. Spelling: There are spelling mistakes, such as "crural" instead of "crucial" and "draw out" instead of "drawn out". 3. Consistency: The use of tenses and formatting (e.g., numbering, capitalization) is inconsistent. 4. Clarity: Some sentences are overly long or complex, making them difficult to follow. 5. Technical language: While generally appropriate, some terms are used incorrectly or inconsistently.	
Please provide your comments regarding the appropriateness of different sections of the manuscript.	Introduction: - Appropriate in introducing the problem of compound leg injuries. - Provides context for the importance of soft tissue coverage. - Could benefit from more recent literature and a clearer statement of the study's specific aims. Methods: - Generally appropriate, describing the patient selection and surgical techniques. - Lacks detail on statistical analysis methods. - Could be more structured for clarity (e.g., separate subsections for patient selection, surgical procedures, and post-operative care). Results: - Presents key findings, but organization could be improved. - Tables are helpful, but some are redundant or could be combined. - More detailed statistical analysis would strengthen this section. Discussion: - Compares findings with existing literature, which is appropriate. - Could benefit from a more structured approach, addressing each main finding systematically. - Lacks a clear discussion of study limitations. Conclusion: - Summarizes key points, but could be more concise and impactful. - Should more clearly state the implications for clinical practice. References: - Appear relevant, but many are quite old. Including more recent literature would strengthen the paper. Overall, while the basic structure is appropriate, each section could benefit from improved organization, clarity, and depth of analysis to meet the standards of scholarly communication.	
Do you think that the references in the manuscript are proper, recent and sufficient? If you have any suggestions, please write here.	The references in the manuscript are generally relevant to the topic, but there are several issues regarding their recency and sufficiency: 1. Recency: - Many of the references are quite old, with several dating back to the 1970s and 1980s.	

BPI Review Form 070520

	- The most recent reference appears to be from 1988, which is over 35 years old at the time of this review. - This lack of recent references is a significant weakness, as it doesn't reflect current advancements in surgical techniques and wound management. 2. Sufficiency: - While the number of references (19) is not necessarily insufficient, the range of sources could be broader. - There's a lack of references to more recent systematic reviews or meta-analyses on the topic. 3. Scope: - The references focus primarily on surgical techniques but lack citations for epidemiology of compound leg injuries or long-term outcomes of different flap techniques. Suggestions: 1. Include recent references (from the last 5-10 years) to reflect current practices and outcomes in flap surgery for compound leg injuries. 2. Add references to any recent technological advancements in wound care or surgical techniques that may influence the approach to these injuries. 3. Include citations from a wider range of journals, including those focusing on trauma, orthopedics, and plastic surgery. 4. Add references to any relevant clinical guidelines or consensus statements on the management of compound leg injuries. 5. Include some references discussing the long-term functional outcomes and quality of life after different flap procedures. 6. Consider adding references that discuss the cost-effectiveness of different approaches, which could be relevant for clinical decision-making. 7. Update the citation style to a consistent, modern format as per the target journal's guidelines. By addressing these suggestions, the manuscript would present a more current and comprehensive view of the topic, strengthening its scholarly value.	
--	---	--

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>	

BPI Review Form 070520

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vivekaradhya M
Department, University & Country	Rajiv Gandhi University of Health Sciences, India