

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORR_84540
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPLANT REMOVAL: CONSIDERATIONS IN A NIGERIAN TEACHING HOSPITAL SETTING
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<https://www.journalajorr.com/index.php/AJORR/editorial-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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>In this paper, 3 cases of pediatric patients are included. In Abstract, this is expressed as "There were 3 Pediatric patients aged 7, 10 and 18 months", but it is judged that there is an error in the indication of age. Correction is required.</p> <p>Keywords are words suggested by "MeSH on Demand" and need to be corrected.</p> <p>In the Introduction, the reference following the sentence "The resulting fractures ~ in the human body, after blood" needs to be modified.</p> <p>In the text of the Results, it is a total of 13 patients. The following sentence states 10 female and 2 males. Correction is required.</p> <p>In Table 2, the sum of the items "Site of implant" is only 10. Correction is required. In the discussion, references following "This is similar to a study done by Haseeb et al [2017]" need to be revised. Correction is required.</p> <p>References need to be modified according to the reference style provided by this journal.</p>	<p>It wasn't judged, we meant that completion of therapy was majorly among pediatric cases according to our analysis.</p> <p>Key words have been corrected</p> <p>Reference has been modified</p> <p>It has been corrected. We used 12 patients</p> <p>Error from our side. It has been effected</p> <p>This is an error from our side. It has been removed.</p> <p>References have been modified according to the journal style.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Rarely, refractures are experienced after implant removal. If you have experienced any complications related to implant removal, including refracture, please describe them in the discussion section.</p>	<p>Our study did not experience any case of refractures. Besides this was a retrospective study. Follow up after implant removal for possible complication was not among the objective of the study</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>Please refer to the following papers. 1) Beate Hanson, Chris van der Werken and Dirk Stengel. "Surgeons' beliefs and perceptions about removal of orthopaedic implants", BMC musculoskeletal disorders, 2008, 9:73. 2) Dagmar Vos, Beate Hansen and Michiel Verhofstad. "Implant removal of osteosynthesis : the Dutch practice. Results of a survey", Journal of Trauma management & outcomes, 2012 : 6:6</p>	

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	Nil. This is a retrospective study