

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJORR_108291</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Exploration of Clinical Practice Teaching Management in Orthopedics from the Perspective of TQM</b>
Type of the Article	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**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><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p><b>1) No.</b> Alternative titles:  <i>"Some notes about a possible exploration of Teaching Management of Clinical Practice in Orthopedics having as support TQM principles"</i>  <b>Or then:</b>  <i>"Some remarks about possible exploration of Teaching Management of Clinical Practice in Orthopedics"</i></p> <p><b>2) No.</b> In my modest opinion the abstract is confuse, and not explicit as well as structure as required. In fact, an abstract of a paper that has to be importance for Scientific Community must have information about: Purpose of the manuscript; Used methodology/approach; Findings; Limitations; Originality/value of the paper.            All general considerations that are presented should be removed, and the use of acronyms/abbreviations should be too correctly uniformized and only described/used at the first time that the related term (on singular and/or plural) appears on the correspondent Section of the manuscript, not on the abstract.</p> <p><b>3) No.</b>            There is not a literature review, a research methodology and method as well as results, and conclusions presented clearly and analysed/discussed appropriately.            The paper does not demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and do not cite an appropriate range of literature sources. Furthermore, along the manuscript, none of the five References (only five References...), is cited as required / usual. No statement supported in terms of Bibliographic References.</p> <p>In my modest opinion the structure of the manuscript should be:            Title            Abstract (no more than 250 words with the information referred before)            Keywords (no more than 6, but only three is few)            1.Introduction            2. Literature review            3. Case study – materials and method            4. Results and discussion            5. Conclusions and future research directons            References            About the authors</p> <p><b>4) No.</b> Some possible suggestions:</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

<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><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DOI:10.1080/10872981.2021.1976443</li> <li>• DOI:10.1007/978-3-031-12914-8_8</li> <li>• DOI 10.1007/s11135-011-9632-9</li> <li>• DOI: doi.org/10.3311/PPso.12675</li> <li>• DOI:10.54891/2786-6998-2022-1-7</li> <li>• DOI:10.26689/jcer.v5i12.2834</li> <li>• DOI:10.12669/pjms.39.2.7653</li> <li>• <a href="https://www.macrothink.org/journal/index.php/ijhrs/article/download/20268/15684">https://www.macrothink.org/journal/index.php/ijhrs/article/download/20268/15684</a></li> </ul> <p>There exist several others.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p><b>YES</b>, for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>---</p>	

**PART 2:**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Manuel Ferreira Rebelo</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Portugal</b></p>