

[Review Form 2](#)

Book Name:	Achievements and Challenges of Medicine and Medical Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3622
Title of the Manuscript:	Acetabular Retrograde Drilling: A New Arthroscopic Technique for Treatment of Chondral Lesions Grade 1 and 2 in Patients with Femoroacetabular Impingement
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	Important component of the clinical case is the differential diagnosis, in which you should explain why you ended up with the final diagnosis. We do not wish to see a bullet point listing of possible diagnoses, but rather a narrative explanation of why you excluded other clinical issues.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Move on to explore how the case presented differently to the admitting team. Alternatively, if your report is focused on management, explore the difficulties the team came across and alternative options for treatment.	
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.	Abstracts of case studies are usually very short, preferably not more than 150 words.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Discussion This is the most important part of the case report; the part that will convince the journal that the case is publication worthy. This section should start by expanding on what has been said in the introduction, focusing on why the case is noteworthy and the problem that it addresses. This part describes the existing theories and research findings on the key issue in the patient's condition. The author should explain whether this corroborates with or detracts from current beliefs about the problem and how this evidence can add value to future clinical practice.	
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.	clinical case is imaging, and this should reflect the high quality standards of the journal	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

[Review Form 2](#)

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Abu-Hussein Muhamad
Department, University & Country	Greece