

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_90011
Title of the Manuscript:	The efficacy of ultrasound guided platelet rich plasma injection versus perineural dextrose injection in the treatment of severe carpal tunnel syndrome
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>)

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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	<p>Thank you for allowing me to review this manuscript on the results of treatment of CTS with perineural PRP and dextrose injections.</p> <p>I think it is an interesting paper, but the authors should consider revision by a native English speaking person with experience in orthopaedic surgery and paper writing (i.e.: the use of "insignificant" to refer to "statistically non-significant" findings is awkward to a scientific paper reader.</p> <p>The Discussion should be better organized: as it is now, it looks simply as a list of the findings of other authors, with minor references to the similarities or differences with the present paper's results, instead of a thoughtful, intellectually inspiring discussion, while I am sure that such is not the case in the authors' minds. Also, the authors should strive to reduce the length of the phrases and the number of words, to make reading easier. As an example, in the first paragraph of the discussion, the authors state: "In our clinical assessment, the results showed significant improvement in VAS for pain and paresthesia after treatment and follow up period as compared to before treatment in both groups with insignificant difference between the 2 groups regarding VAS for pain before treatment while the difference was significant between the 2 groups regarding VAS for pain 3 months after treatment with better improvement in group1." But logically, it could be written as: "The most important finding of the present study is that there is a statistically significant improvement in VAS for pain and paresthesia after treatment as compared to before treatment in both groups (p=0.001), with better improvement in group 1 (P=.001) 3 months after treatment."</p> <p>Tables should be better prepared, probably by simply reducing the size of letters, to accommodate to single lines and make them easier to read and understand. They should be referred in the text.</p> <p>The use of references including the name and year of publication in the text plus the reference number in brackets should be changed to the name (if necessary) and the reference number in brackets, as per publication rules. At the same time, the authors could reduce further the number of words in the text. As an example: the authors wrote: "Raeissadat et al. (2018)⁽²⁸⁾ reported that the mechanism of PRP in CTS was uncertain and probably multifactorial; first, it could promote angiogenesis, neurogenesis, and regeneration via direct effects on the MN itself. Second, it could reduce the inflammation and swelling of the flexor tenosynovitis. Therefore, the PRP could decrease swelling of the flexor tendon and, it would result in reduction of intracarpal pressure exerted on the MN.</p> <p>Moreover, Kuffler (2013)⁽²⁹⁾ stated that PRP may take effect by eliminating inflammation and initiating a series of biological processes such as tissue remodeling, wound repair, and axonal regeneration.</p> <p>The application of PRP increases the number of nerve fibers after peripheral nerve re-anastomosis and can produce a neurotrophic effect, stimulating the proliferation of Schwann cells and myelination, which are important components during peripheral nerve repair⁽³⁰⁾</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	An the text could be modified to: “ The mechanism of action of PRP in CTS is uncertain and probably multifactorial (28, 29, 30); it has been suggested that could promote angiogenesis, neurogenesis, and regeneration via direct effects on the MN itself, initiating a series of biological processes such as tissue remodeling, wound repair, and axonal regeneration, which would stimulate the proliferation of Schwann cells and myelination, which are important components during peripheral nerve repair. At the same time, PRP could reduce the inflammation and swelling of the flexor tenosynovitis, which would result in reduction of intracarpal pressure exerted on the MN”	
Minor REVISION comments	There should be CONCLUSIONS at the end of the text	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rafael Arriaza
Department, University & Country	INCIDE Research Group University of A Coruña, Spain