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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The topic of this work is interesting. In this manuscript, a total of 137 patients underwent surgical treatment for a pilon fracture were selected and divided into two groups according to whether it develop an infection to compare risk factors for postoperative infection after open reduction and internal fixation for a pilon fracture. Demographic, clinical, and surgical factors were compared between the two groups. A binary logistic regression analysis was used to determine the OR and corresponding 95%CI for significant risk factors for postoperative infection. They finally concluded that Infection prevention for patients with a Ruedi-Allgower fracture type III, surgical incision type III, wound contamination, and diabetes lowers the postoperative infection risk after surgical management of tibial pilon fractures. The tables help the readers to make a more understanding of the study. The whole manuscript is well drafted. Also, the manuscript also reviewed previous related literature. However, I have the following questions and comments: - Why did you choose these indicators from the current study as the focus? Why not choose something else? -There are a few results at present. Are there any other findings? If possible, additional studies are needed to make the results more credible. -English language correction through the manuscript.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Dear author, thank you for sharing your article entitled “Identification of risk factors for surgical site infection after type II and type III tibial pilon fracture surgery”. Your article is good in grammar and scientific writing rules. The topic is actual and well described.
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**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The article provides an essential reference for researchers in this field and the results are interesting and could be useful for other studies. Patients with these risk factors included type III fracture, a surgical incision type III, presence of wound contamination, and diabetes should be monitored closely to improve outcomes. As such, their findings provide a basis to develop prevention protocols to lower the risk of postoperative infection and improve the outcomes of patients with tibial pilon fractures. Editing and proofreading are needed to maintain the best sense of reading. I recommend that the manuscript can be published.