SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_47906
Title of the Manuscript:	A Systematic Review of Factors Associated with Both Bilateral and Recurrent Anterior Cruciate Ligament Disruption
Type of the Article	Review Paper

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	ABSTRACT Methods: you did not mention the inclusion criteria. Conclusion: which "patient's psychological state"?	
	INTRODUCTION Your numbering of References is weird. Can you follow the order of appearance in text? 27-28: can you precise how elevated are the risks (with a Reference)? 34: "his family", can you precise why is it "catastrophic"? With a Reference? 39: "We aim to provide" instead of "This systematic review creates"	
	METHODOLOGY I'd rather "Material and Methods" or only "Methods" for this title section. 44: replace "comprehensive" by "systematic". 45-46: erase "This systematic.review". 47: "until December".	
	RESULTS Same comment for the numbering of References. Did not you want to make an analysis of he results of the 23 studies here? This is a major problem in your study: you did not compare the results (numbers and tables) in this section.	
	DISCUSSION 92-93: what do you mean "This decision might be influencedfamily member"? Without reference link, and what is the point in this study? 136: which ones have not? 226-227: which kind of collagens and proteoglycan polymorphisms are associated? 227-228: "morphology, family lifestyle" what is this? No explanation and no reference link 239: what is "poor knee function" exactly? IKDC score, ROM, other? 250-251: erase "which carries obvious repercussions, and". 270: "Sonnery-Cottet".	
	CONCLUSION 361-365: you may erase This studyPRISMA guidelines" because it was previously mentioned, and is not for the Conclusion section. 366-371: these sentences are for the Discussion section	
Minor REVISION comments	Coc of the those conteness are for the biodescient cocient	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

<u>PART 2:</u>		
	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)
	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Prod'homme Marc
Department, University & Country	University of Grenoble, France

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)