



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_49311
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTERIOR KNEE PAIN SYNDROME
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:

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



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This article needs to be organized. Currently, there is an abstract, an introduction, and then a conclusion. There needs to be separations for each particular syndrome, and this should follow a logical progression. Right now, it looks like the introduction ends at line [54].</p> <p>[65] – “goose foot” is called the pes anserine in most sources.</p> <p>[73-75] – there should be a source for this statement. Its not wrong, but you need to cite a source.</p> <p>[83-88] – again, you need a source for this, even though it is correct.</p> <p>[140-182] – This whole section needs to be edited. Right now, it follows no logical order. Rather, its reads as any possible problem that can occur in the knee joint extension mechanism. You can organize by acute and chronic, giving the specific signs/symptoms, causes, and radiographic changes. Again, the information is fine, but the point of a review article is to organize this information into an easily understandable summary. You may need to eliminate a significant amount of information here to achieve that goal.</p> <p>183- the end – Again, there is no specific organization to this material. The value of a review article such as your is not to merely list any possible problem. It needs to be organized for easier digestion by the reader.</p> <p>Conclusion – Although correct, you need to be saying something more conclusive that there merely being many causes for knee pain. This can be done by organizing similar conditions into several categories. Really, you shouldn't have more than 3-4 categories. The information is not the main problem. However, this article needs to organized in a way that useful information can be quickly and accurately used by a reader. Currently, that will require a significant re-write. However, as the information is accurate, this can be done.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>[20] – some other sources say low back pain is the most common, so I usually write this as “one of the most common causes” or something like that.</p> <p>[22] - ‘took away the efforts’ - try rephrasing this as it is not easily understood. Possibly say how doctors were not able to isolate causes, or something like that.</p> <p>[61] – peripheral is misspelled.</p> <p>[67] – subchondral is misspelled</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The first sentences of the Abstract do not read well. I think you're trying to say that knee pain has many possible causes and that proper diagnosis can take some time. However, even with the anatomical complexity of the knee joint, pathological causes for pain can be determined. Practitioners should be able to make superior diagnosis than just merely generalized knee pain.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Timothy Hui
Department, University & Country	USA