

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORR_97624
Title of the Manuscript:	My hand, my survival: Rehabilitating the Hand for Optimal Function
Type of the Article	Case study

### 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>	<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? No problem</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable? No problem</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?No problem</b>  <b>3. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Good enough</b>  <b>4. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Good enough</b>  <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? It is necessary to additionally describe the thesis discussion and add references to it.(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	English language and style Moderate English changes required. Check the correct reference format according to the author guidelines of this journal.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	This study suggested very interesting results and experimental suggestions.  Also, this paper is well written with logical flow.  However, I found some minor limitations and suggest revision related these issues.  This paper deserves to be published after minor revisions. It is necessary to additionally describe the thesis discussion and add references to it.	

### 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>Jung, Jin-Hwa</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Semyung University, South Korea</b>