

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_117566
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of Orthopedic Injuries in Amateur Runners in the Municipality of Gurupi-To.
Type of the 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.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, the manuscript holds importance for the scientific community as it addresses a gap in understanding orthopedic injuries among amateur runners. It provides insights into injury characteristics and influencing factors promoting safe running practices. The study's findings have practical implications for healthcare professionals and trainers, contributing to injury prevention and treatment strategies. Furthermore, it stimulates further research in this area, ultimately benefiting both scientific knowledge and public health. 2. The given title effectively communicates the main focus of the study. It clearly indicates the subject (orthopedic injuries), the target population (amateur runners), and the specific location (Gurupi-To municipality). 3. The abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the study's aims, methodology, key findings, and conclusions. However, it lacks numerical data in the results section, which could enhance its comprehensiveness. Additionally, to improve clarity and completeness, the abstract could include specific numerical findings mentioned in the results section, such as the percentage of participants experiencing injuries, demographics of the surveyed population (e.g., gender distribution, age ranges), prevalence of orthopedic injuries, and details on runners' training practices (e.g., frequency, duration, distances covered). Incorporating such quantitative data would provide readers with a clearer understanding of the study's results and findings. Additionally, the abstract could elaborate more on the significance and implications of the study's findings for the field of sports medicine, injury prevention, and public health, further enhancing its comprehensiveness. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear appropriate, providing clear organization and flow of information. However, the MATERIAL AND METHODS section could benefit from additional details to enhance clarity and reproducibility. Including more specifics on the questionnaire used, such as the types of questions asked and how they were formulated, would provide readers with a better understanding of the data collection process. Additionally, detailing the inclusion and exclusion criteria for participant selection, as well as any measures taken to ensure data privacy and confidentiality, would further strengthen the methodology section. Providing clear and comprehensive information in this section is crucial for readers to assess the validity and reliability of the study's findings. 5. The references provided appear to be sufficient and recent, covering relevant literature related to orthopedic injuries in amateur runners. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Given the detection that 65% of the article text is AI-generated, it's important to review and potentially eliminate or revise sections where AI-generated content predominates. By balancing AI-generated content with human input and addressing specific concerns, the manuscript can better meet the standards of scientific rigor and comprehensiveness. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript presents a comprehensive investigation into the prevalence and factors influencing orthopedic injuries among amateur runners in Gurupi, To.. The study's methodology, combining quantitative and qualitative analysis, provides valuable insights into the diverse experiences and practices of runners, while the results highlight the complexity of factors contributing to injuries. However, there are areas for improvement, such as enhancing the clarity and detail in the methodology section, ensuring the abstract adequately reflects the numerical data presented in the results, and addressing concerns regarding the proportion of AI-generated content. Strengthening these aspects will enhance the manuscript's contribution to the scientific community by providing a clearer understanding of orthopedic injury patterns in amateur runners and guiding future research and preventive strategies in sports medicine.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hemantajit Gogoi
Department, University & Country	Rajiv Gandhi University, India