

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_131132
Title of the Manuscript:	Anthropometric Study Of Angle Of Humeral Torsion Of South-South, South-East Of Nigeria
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Comments

	<b>Reviewer’s comment</b> <b>Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.</b>	<b>Author’s Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript provides valuable anthropometric data on humeral torsion angles in the South-South and South-East Nigerian populations. Such studies contribute to understanding anatomical variations across different ethnic groups, which is crucial for orthopedic, sports medicine, and rehabilitation applications. The findings also provide insights into potential biomechanical implications, such as susceptibility to shoulder injuries. Additionally, this research can serve as a reference point for further comparative studies on humeral torsion across various populations.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The current title is informative but could be more concise and precise. A suggested alternative: <b>"Anthropometric Study of Humeral Torsion Angle in South-South and South-East Nigeria"</b>	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract covers the essential components of the study, including aims, methodology, results, and conclusion. However, it could be improved by briefly mentioning the clinical relevance of humeral torsion and potential applications of the findings. Additionally, refining the conclusion to highlight the study’s contribution to scientific literature would enhance its impact.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript appears scientifically sound in its methodology and data analysis. However, a clearer discussion on the clinical implications of humeral torsion variations would strengthen the study. Also, some sections require improved clarity in explaining the significance of findings.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references appear relevant, but it would be beneficial to include more recent studies (from the last five years) on humeral torsion, especially those relating to biomechanics, clinical significance, and racial/ethnic comparisons.	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The manuscript is understandable but requires minor grammatical corrections and improved sentence structure for better scholarly communication. Some sentences are lengthy or repetitive, and simplifying them would enhance readability. Additionally, ensuring consistency in terminology (e.g., "humeral torsion angle" vs. "angle of humeral torsion") would improve clarity.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Kamalakannan M
Department, University & Country	Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Sciences, India