

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)
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.	This review highlights prevalent issue among athletes facing glenohumeral joint dislocation and provides a comprehensive overview of its epidemiology, diagnosis, classification, and management. It highlights the need for tailored treatment approaches, particularly the early surgical intervention in high-risk athletes, which can have significant implications for preventing recurrent injuries and improving long-term outcomes. However, it could be strengthened by incorporating more specific data and a deeper discussion of the risks associated with various surgical approaches.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well-structured and follows a logical progression typical of review articles. It includes sections such as the Abstract, Introduction, Epidemiology and Etiology, Classification, Diagnosis, and Management, with subsections for surgical procedures and diagnostic tests. This organization allows for a comprehensive and clear review of the topic, facilitating ease of understanding for readers.	
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.	The Review supports its discussion with well-researched epidemiological data and references studies evaluating both nonoperative and surgical interventions, offering insights into recurrence rates and treatment outcomes. The diagnostic techniques and surgical approaches are described in detail, reflecting current clinical practices and advancements in sports medicine.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are not sufficient. There are a lot of sections in the manuscript which lack proper citation, I would suggest to the authors please cite information you have discussed through the review.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	Despite the manuscript's strengths, a few limitations exist. It lacks discussion on emerging technologies and advancements in surgical techniques, which could enhance treatment options for shoulder dislocations. Additionally, more emphasis on long-term follow-up data would provide a clearer understanding of patient outcomes. Lastly, the focus is heavily on young, male athletes, with limited consideration of other populations, such as women or older individuals, which could improve the review's inclusivity.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Noman Khan
Department, University & Country	Mohammad Ali Jinnah University, Pakistan