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**Reviewer’s report:**

I feel that the article although it has some limitations will add valuable evidence to the area.

**Minor Essential Revisions:**

The writing is largely acceptable however needs to be re checked as I noted a number of spelling errors (some of which are listed below), this is presumably a result of the translation process.

Methods section: “Type of urgery”

Methods section typing: “anankle fracture”

Background: “56% respons rate”

Background “withtrimalleolar”

Authors section: grammatical error: “wried the article”

**Discretionary Revisions:**

I believe the methodology is replicable and forms of grading / measurement are referenced. I note ankle dorsiflexion was measured by using a goniometer on a once inch platform however, what were the defined reference points for skin markings was this a standardized technique with established inter / intra observer reliability? Was this measurement taken by the one observer?

Were the open reduction internal fixation procedures performed by the one surgeon or multiple. Inter practitioner varation in surgical technique may be listed as an additional limitation.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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