

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_86431
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of dextrose versus corticosteroid injection guided by ultrasound in treatment of lateral epicondylitis
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

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	Dear Autor, 1- Abstract should be revised and detailed. VAS that took place in results should also be in methods too. Abstract should be written again. 2- How was the sample size calculated? 3- How was the randomization performed? 4- What is your hypothesis? Primary outcome? Secondary outcome? 5- Why did you choose 2 injection method ? we generally inject corticosteroid for one time but dextrose for 4-5 times. What was the interval between two injections? 6- The results about age should be in results not in discussion? Results should be reorganized. 7- Discussion should be totally revised and the topic should be discussed systematically, later contributions to science and limitations of the study should be given. 8- Conclusion should be more detailed.	Comment accepted and considered
Minor REVISION comments	9- The article needs English edition . Some structures of sentences were used several times and there are lots of speeling problems.	Grammatical mistakes are rectified
Optional/General comments	Very valuable scientific finding but too much methodological and structural error. After majör revision the article could be evaluated for publication.	Manuscript is checked and syntax errors were fixed

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	