

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORR_98378
Title of the Manuscript:	Advancements in Engineering for the Treatment of Joint Diseases
Type of the Article	Review 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> )

### 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 REVISION</b> comments  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is an important topic for research;</li> <li>2. The title is suitable, has merit and highlights the article;</li> <li>3. At abstract, minor style corrections are needed;</li> <li>4. The subsections seem confusing to whoever wrote the paper. Review paper has a defined topics, with general sections as Introduction, body of the paper, Conclusion and future directions appearing inside and not distributed;</li> <li>5. The paper is scientifically correct, but can increase the prominence and expressiveness if future directions topic is better described, since as a pivotal part of paper;</li> <li>6. The references can be more recent and is described in strange form;</li> <li>7. There are very long and confuses paragraphs at text.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I recommend a major revision about signals, spaces, formatting and uppercase uses. There are a lot of mistakes and missings throughout the text.</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	it is good material that needs to be better worked on and adjusted before publishing.	

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Maíra Florentino Pessoa</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Brazil</b>