

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-59509

Title: The ACL Economy: Why a Free Warm-Up Loses to a \$26,000 Surgery in Youth Sport.

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
- Accept after minor revision.....
- ✓ Accept after major revision
- Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance		✓		

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strength of the study:

- Addresses an important problem in youth sports injury prevention.
- Combines published research with a club-level economic model.
- Summarises evidence supporting neuromuscular warm-up programmes.
- Highlights the gap between awareness and proper implementation.
- Compares prevention costs with surgical payments and long-term consequences.
- Explains how financial incentives influence prevention practices.
- Presents three testable propositions for future research.
- Provides practical recommendations for clubs, leagues and insurers.

Weakness of the study:

- The literature review is narrative rather than systematic.
- Implementation findings rely on a survey from one region.
- The economic model uses hypothetical assumptions and published estimates.
- Cost figures come from different settings and years.
- Coach time and programme delivery costs are not directly measured.
- The proposed business explanation has not been tested using primary data.
- Model assumptions and results require independent verification.
- Some numerical and presentation details need clarification.

Reviewers Comments:

The manuscript presents an interesting management and health economics perspective on the underuse of ACL injury prevention programmes in youth sport. Its main strength is the integration of published evidence, coach implementation data and a model involving 100 female players. The discussion of incentives, accountability and the mismatch between prevention costs and financial savings offers a useful framework for future research. However, the model depends on assumptions about baseline injury risk, programme effectiveness and implementation, so its estimates should not be interpreted as predictions for individual clubs. The use of surgical payment estimates from different settings also limits direct economic comparison. The authors should independently verify the calculations, clarify the assumptions behind the delivery scenarios and distinguish modelled savings from demonstrated real-world savings. The narrative review methods and source selection could be described more transparently. As the study uses published aggregate data and no human participants, ethical approval is generally not required. The manuscript is clearly structured, but numerical consistency, references and figure presentation require careful checking. Overall, it is promising but needs revision before publication.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Previously Published anywhere/Plagiarism check:

The manuscript discusses established research on ACL injury prevention, neuromuscular warm-ups and sports health economics. These subjects have been extensively studied, but the paper's proposed business explanation and club-level model may provide a distinct perspective. Similarity of topic or use of published evidence does not itself establish plagiarism. The manuscript should be checked using formal similarity detection software, with particular attention to wording, tables, figures and source attribution. The author should also ensure that all cited references and numerical estimates are accurate and verifiable.