

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORR_124896
Title of the Manuscript:	Current Review of Glenohumeral Joint Dislocation in Athlete : Literature Review
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides a comprehensive and up-to-date review of glenohumeral joint dislocations in athletes, an area of significant concern in sports medicine. It synthesizes recent findings on diagnosis, classification, and both surgical and non-surgical treatment options, helping clinicians make evidence-based decisions for better outcomes in athletes. I particularly appreciate the manuscript's clear focus on treatment algorithms and its emphasis on the early intervention in high-risk populations, which is critical for preventing recurrent injuries. The detailed discussion of surgical techniques and their complications adds practical value to orthopedic and sports medicine practitioners.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is appropriate, as it clearly reflects the manuscript's focus on the epidemiology, classification, diagnosis, and management of glenohumeral joint dislocations in athletes. It aligns with the content presented in the manuscript. However, consider rewording it slightly for clarity and brevity: "A Comprehensive Review of Glenohumeral Joint Dislocation in Athletes."</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is generally comprehensive, offering a concise summary of the key elements: the focus on athletes, epidemiology, diagnosis, and management of glenohumeral dislocations. However, it would benefit from a clearer emphasis on the importance of early surgical intervention for athletes, as this is a central theme in the manuscript. Additionally, include some statistical data on the incidence and recurrence rates, as mentioned in the main body. This would strengthen the abstract's informativeness.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript is well-structured with clear subsections on epidemiology, classification, diagnosis, and treatment. Each section logically flows into the next. The use of images and diagrams enhances the clarity of the text, particularly in the diagnosis and management sections.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust, as it draws on current literature and presents a well-balanced review of the epidemiology and treatment options for glenohumeral dislocation. The discussion on surgical versus non-surgical treatment options, with a focus on athletes, is comprehensive and supported by appropriate evidence. The inclusion of detailed descriptions of diagnostic tests and surgical techniques adds depth to the manuscript. Moreover, it incorporates up-to-date studies, making it technically sound and reflective of the current consensus in sports medicine and orthopedics.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>The references are mostly sufficient and recent, with many cited from 2017 to 2023. However, to strengthen the review, it could benefit from the inclusion of more recent studies on long-term outcomes of non-surgical treatments in athletes, particularly randomized controlled trials that compare different surgical approaches like the Latarjet and Bankart procedures. Consider adding the following recent references to bolster the literature review:</p> <p>Hasebroock, A. W., Brinkman, J., Foster, L., & Bowens, J. P. (2019). Management of primary anterior shoulder dislocations: a narrative review <i>Sports Medicine - Open</i>, 5, Article 311.</p> <p>Liaghat, B., Pedersen, J. R., Young, J. J., Thorlund, J. B., & Juul-Kristensen, B. (2021). Joint hypermobility in athletes is associated with shoulder injuries: a systematic review and meta-analysis <i>BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders</i>, 22, Article 3892.</p> <p>Lorente, A., Mariscal, G., Barrios, C., & Lorente, R. (2023) Nerve Injuries after Glenohumeral Dislocation, a Systematic Review of Incidence and Risk Factors. <i>Journal of Clinical Medicine</i>. 12(13):4546. https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm12134546</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript's language is generally clear, but there are occasional grammatical errors and instances of awkward phrasing. For example, "The glenohumeral joint dislocation (GHJ) often referred to as shoulder dislocation manifests predominantly..." could be simplified for better flow. I recommend a thorough proofreading to improve readability.</p> <p>In the abstract, add data on recurrence rates for a more quantitative summary.</p> <p>In the "Management" section, consider adding a brief discussion on the limitations of current treatment methods, such as the potential for post-operative complications in athletes undergoing the Latarjet procedure.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Please ensure that the references are properly cited in accordance with journal style, as well as that they are included.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Joenil G. Frayco
Department, University & Country	North Eastern Mindanao State University, Philippines