

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. | |
| Minor REVISION comments | 9- The article needs English edition . Some structures of sentences were used several times and there are lots of speeling problems. | |
| Optional/General comments | Very valuable scientific finding but too much methodological and structural error. After major revision the article could be evaluated for publication. | |

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) | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Özlem Akan |
| Department, University & Country | Baskent University Alanya Training and Research Hospital, Turkey |