

Manuscript No.: IJAR-53769

Date: 12-09-2025

**Title: Functional and Radiological Outcome of Distal Tibia Fractures Treated With Minimally Invasive Plate Osteosynthesis □ A Retrospective Study.**

## Recommendation:

Accept as it is .....

**Accept after minor revision.....**

Accept after major revision .....

Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance		✓		

Reviewer Name: Dr. Aamina

## Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

## Overall Evaluation

This retrospective study of 34 patients examines functional and radiological outcomes after minimally invasive plate osteosynthesis (MIPO) for distal tibial fractures. The paper is well structured with a detailed methodology (lines 62–171), clear statistical analysis (158–167), and comprehensive results (172–209). It addresses a clinically relevant question and compares favorably with current literature (lines 237–267). Minor revisions to improve clarity, consistency, and reporting of certain details are recommended.

## Major Comments

### 1. Abstract Clarity

*Lines 4–23:*

- Sentence at line 19–21 is fragmented (“minimally invasive plate osteosynthesis. is...”). Remove the extra period and smooth the flow.
- Consider adding the exact sample size and key statistical outcomes (e.g., mean AOFAS improvement, p-values) to strengthen the abstract.

## 2. Methodology Detail

*Lines 62–171:*

- Specify how missing data, if any, were handled.
- Line 66–67: Provide IRB approval number or statement of waiver for transparency.
- Line 83–99: The sample-size formula is helpful but formatting is awkward; present it as an equation or move to an appendix.

## 3. Results Presentation

*Lines 173–209:*

- Figures and tables are mentioned (e.g., Figure 1, Tables 1–3) but no actual figures are included. Ensure all visuals are provided, clearly labeled, and de-identified.
- Table formatting (lines 180–195) should be standardized with headings and units.

## 4. Discussion Depth

*Lines 212–317:*

- Strengthen the comparison of this cohort's early AOFAS scores (lines 237–245) with possible reasons for the lower 3-month outcome—rehabilitation differences, fracture severity, etc.
- Briefly address potential biases inherent in a retrospective single-center design.

## Minor Line-Specific Suggestions

- **Line 15:** “weredistal(50%) as well as lateral(50%) tibial fracture” → “were distal (50%) and lateral (50%) tibial fractures.”
- **Lines 87–99:** Present the sample size equation in one concise line for readability.
- **Lines 140–141:** Correct the line break in “follow-ups ensured that the progression...”.
- **Lines 211 & 205:** Ensure Figure 1 is inserted with a legend describing union time.
- **References (318–409):**
  - Check journal abbreviations and spacing for consistency.
  - Verify all in-text citations match the reference list (e.g., confirm that [7-9] at line 56 correctly corresponds).

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

*www.journalijar.com*

---

## Strengths

- **Clear Structure:** Well-organized sections—Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion—facilitate understanding.
- **Comprehensive Data:** Includes VAS, AOFAS, and Rasmussen scores with appropriate statistical analysis.
- **Clinical Relevance:** Supports MIPO as a viable option with low complication rates and timely fracture union (~12 weeks).