

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORR_78000
Title of the Manuscript:	The coverage of large skin tissue losses of the hand by the Mac Grégor flap
Type of the Article	

**General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal’s peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of ‘**lack of Novelty**’, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.  
To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
1. There are too many grammatical and structure errors. 2.it s not Mac Gregor flap. It is Mc Gregor flap 3.So many terminological errors 4.it is not island flap !	1.no original and new content 2. There are too many grammatical and structure errors. 3.it s not Mac Gregor flap. It is Mc Gregor flap 4.please explain more about composite Mc Gregor flap. 5.How did you get the conclusion that the results were good in % 90 of patients. 6.there are so many terminological errors:for example there is no such a thing as fascio skin flap.It is fasciocutaneous flap . Skin substance loss is incorrect and absurd definition for a defect. There are a lot of terminological errors like that with in the submission. 7.Please , use same term for the flap in the manuscript.You have used all different names of the flap , groin flap , Mc Gregor flap etc. pick one and use that within the manuscript. 8.You defined Mc Gregor flap as an island flap and referenced with article authored by Mc Gregor himself. But in his definition this flap is a pedicled tubed flap not an island flap.	2. grammatical and structure errors are corrected. 3. spelling is corrected 4. a short explanation is included in the results 5. it was based on patient appreciation  6.terminoloical errors were corrected  7. we have chosen the term “Mc Gregor flap” to use in the entire manuscript  8. definition corrected
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Heavy language and structural editing is needed Terminological and technical errors which I have indicated above must be corrected References are not same style	Language as been edited References are corrected

PART 2:

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