

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORR_102214
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of the Functional and Clinical Outcomes of Arthroscopic Release of Extensor Carpi Radialis Brevis in Management of Chronic Lateral Epicondylitis
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> )

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community? Must be improved</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable? Must be improved</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Must be improved</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Must be improved</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Must be improved</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. Must be improved. 1 out of 13 references are papers before 2000.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>English language and style Moderate English changes required.</p> <p>Check the correct reference format according to the author guidelines of this journal.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The current manuscript presents only 13 references. A limitation of this study is the absence of a control group. It does not specify or describe the results obtained. I think need to rewrite the tables and figures with higher quality.</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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Jung, Jin-Hwa</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Semyeong University, South Korea</b>