



# Clarifications Regarding "Investigation of Morphological and Biomechanical Properties of the Scapula for Shoulder Joint"

## "Omuz Ekleminde Skapulanın Morfolojik ve Biyomekanik Özelliklerinin İncelenmesi" Hakkında Açıklamalar

✉ Rajesh KUMAR<sup>1</sup>, ✉ Dibakar BORTHAKUR<sup>2</sup>, ✉ Chetan SAHNI<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Department of Anatomy, Patna, India

<sup>2</sup>All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Department of Anatomy, New Delhi, India

<sup>3</sup>Banaras Hindu University, Institute of Medical Sciences, Department of Anatomy, Varanasi, India

**Keywords:** Scapula, morphometry, glenopolar angle, glenoid cavity  
**Anahtar kelimeler:** Skapula, morfometri, glenopolar açı, glenoid kavite

### Dear Editor,

We read the article titled "Investigation of Morphological and Biomechanical Properties of the Scapula for Shoulder Joint" with utmost interest<sup>1</sup>. The authors have described various morphometric parameters of the scapula and compared those with previous literature. We appreciate the authors for their dedicated efforts.

We need clarifications from the authors regarding a few points in this article. After calculating the glenopolar angle by the given formula using their own measurements (mean), we found a negative value. Also, a reference for calculating  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  angles was not found. The sample size calculation for this study was not mentioned. Age, sex, and side of the scapulae used were not mentioned. The outermost point of the medial border of the scapula shown in Figure 1 does not seem to be the outermost point. We can see that some parts of the scapula are more outer as compared to the point mentioned. In paragraph 4, under the Introduction section, they

mentioned the hypothesis of the study. They used the word biomechanics in the hypothesis while the study was done on dry bone; we sought clarification regarding that. Actual parts of the coracoid process and acromial process, from where measurements were taken, are not mentioned in Figure 4. In Figure 5, they quoted the maximum length of the coracoid process, while they measured only the horizontal portion of the coracoid process. The line joining the inferior angle of the scapula to the top of the glenoid cavity was not appropriately placed in Figure 6.

We would appreciate the author's response to this letter. Thank you for your consideration.

### Ethics

### Author Contributions

Surgical and Medical Practices: R.K., D.B., C.S., Concept: R.K., D.B., C.S., Analysis or Interpretation: R.K., D.B., C.S., Literature Search: R.K., D.B., C.S., Writing: R.K., D.B., C.S.

**Address for Correspondence:** R. Kumar, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Department of Anatomy, Patna, India

**E-mail:** dr.rajes11314@aiimspatna.org **ORCID ID:** orcid.org/0000-0002-8743-7541

**Received:** 07 December 2023

**Accepted:** 21 December 2023

**Online First:** 04 January 2024

**Cite as:** Kumar R, Borthakur D, Sahni C. Clarifications Regarding "Investigation of Morphological and Biomechanical Properties of the Scapula for Shoulder Joint". Medeni Med J 2024;39:66-67



**Conflict of Interest:** The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

**Financial Disclosure:** The authors declared that this study has received no financial support.

## **REFERENCES**

1. Tuncel Cini N, Guner Sak N, Babacan S, Ari I. Investigation of Morphological and Biomechanical Properties of the Scapula for Shoulder Joint. *Medeni Med J.* 2023;38:159-66.