



REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-56538

Title: A COMPARATIVE STUDY IN ADHESIVE CAPSULITIS BETWEEN MANIPULATION UNDER GENERAL ANAESTHESIA WITH STEROID INJECTION VS USG GUIDED HYDRODISTENTION WITH STEROID INJECTION.

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. Amina

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

The manuscript compares two commonly used treatment approaches for adhesive capsulitis—manipulation under general anesthesia (MUA) with steroid injection and ultrasound-guided hydrodistension with steroid injection—using the Shoulder Pain and Disability Index (SPADI) and disability scores. The topic is clinically relevant because frozen shoulder significantly affects shoulder mobility and patient quality of life. The study attempts a comparative design and uses a recognized outcome measure, which are positive aspects. However, the manuscript contains several grammatical and formatting errors, and many sections require clearer organization and professional language editing. Additionally, the literature review is excessively detailed with basic anatomical descriptions, while important recent studies are not sufficiently cited.

Methodological details also require clarification before the manuscript can be considered for publication. The sample size and patient demographics are not clearly reported, and the randomization process, inclusion and exclusion criteria, and treatment protocols need better explanation. The follow-up period appears limited, which may not adequately assess outcomes for a chronic condition such as adhesive capsulitis. The presentation of results should also be improved with properly formatted tables and clearer statistical descriptions. Furthermore, details regarding ethics committee approval are incomplete. Overall, the manuscript addresses an important clinical question, but substantial revision in terms of methodology, structure, language, and referencing is necessary. Therefore, a **major revision** is recommended before the manuscript can be reconsidered for publication