

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORR_108713
Title of the Manuscript:	Shoulder Surgery Unveiled: A Comparative Analysis of Arthroscopic and Open Rotator Cuff Repair in Patients with Rotator Cuff Tears
Type of the Article	Review Article

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1) Unfortunately the manuscript doesn't bring anything new for orthopaedic community. It's admitted today that open or arthroscopic shoulder stabilisation gives same clinical results at long term for patients. Furthermore in the title, and in methods authors are talking about rotator cuff surgery and in the introduction, results, discussion and conclusion they are talking about shoulder instability ... It's completely different pathologies and patients ... Does authors understood the difference ? I don't think so ...</p> <p>2) The title isn't suitable at all ... I can't suggest an alternative title because manuscript is so confusing between rotator cuff lesions and shoulder instability ...</p> <p>3) Subsections are not appropriate too ... This is a systematic review, results AND discussion must be separated ...</p> <p>4) References are not sufficient for me because the scanning method PRISMA hasn't been used ...</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	I think this manuscript presents a great lack of methodology, and a lack of comprehension of different shoulder pathologies...	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Matthieu Peras
Department, University & Country	Insitut Universitaire de L'appareil Locomoteur et du Sport, France