

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_128734
Title of the Manuscript:	Radiofrequency Neurotomy in non-surgical Patients with chronic Hip Pain
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	There is a definite need for further treatments for patients who cannot qualify for hip surgery. There are some conservative therapies available; however, none work for everyone. Hip radiofrequency appears to be a viable option that may work for several individuals.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	It is hard to say. There are several missing components to the manuscript which I detailed below.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No. Several of the references do not have to do with hip radiofrequency but lumbar spine based procedures. These are not the same and the authors should find different references to justify their points. In addition, there is essentially no discussion section in this manuscript, which significantly weakens the manuscript.	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Figures 6-7 are not in English. The rest is suitable.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>See comments below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction: can remove the first two paragraphs. Start the manuscript at the sentence "Nociceptive pain of the somatic type...". The rest of the information before that is not necessary. 2. Introduction: need a citation for the review article published in The Clinical Journal of Pain that was mentioned. 3. Introduction: Need to define the acronym "ATC". 4. Introduction: More than just "hip anatomy" should be used to define Fig. 1. It would be more appropriate to have a description of the things contained in the image. 5. Introduction: Remove the word "from" from before 10-15%. 6. Introduction: The statement about the targets of the of the procedure is incorrect. The way it currently reads, it sounds like you target the obturator and femoral nerves, which is incorrect and would cause disability in a patient. Please clarify. 7. Introduction: Description of the procedures of radiofrequency should be placed under the methods, not the introduction. 8. Introduction: There is no aim statement describing the purpose of this study. 9. Methods: The "(one year)" is not needed since the authors describe the time period. 10. Methods: The acronym "RF" needs to be defined before its use. In addition, again, the obturator and femoral nerves are not the targets. That is a dangerous mistake. 11. Methods: WOMAC and VAS need to be described before using the acronyms 12. Methods: The statement "Of the 22 patients evaluated..." needs to go into the results not methods. 13. Methods: A more descriptive and complete explanation of the statistics is needed. 14. Methods: Figures 3-4 are not needed. The most important is Figure 5 showing the actual needle placement under fluoroscopy. 15. Results: VAS has now been defined as an acronym multiple times. Define it at first use and not again afterwards. 16. Results: I am not sure the connection between Figure 1 referenced in the second paragraph of the results and the hip anatomy which is Figure 1. 17. Figure 6 is in another language, yet the rest of the manuscript is in English. Please fix so the same language is used throughout. 18. Results: How do you have a $p < 0$? That's not a statistical possibility. Please fix. 19. Results: It appears from Figure 6 that both groups had a decline in treatment effectiveness over time. Please discuss this. 20. Figure 7 is in another language, yet the rest of the manuscript is in English. Please fix so the same language is used throughout. There also needs to be a description for Figure 7. 21. "Discussion" is in another language. Please fix so it is the same as the rest of the manuscript in English. 22. Discussion: Respectfully, this is not a discussion. There are 2 sentences that reference other articles and the rest of it is a recap of this current study. Much more should be discussed in this section, including (as examples) prior studies of hip radiofrequency ablation, types of ablation vs. PRF, effectiveness stated in prior studies compared to this one, why certain areas of anatomy are chosen, other procedural plans (do they all target the same areas with the same number of needles), etc. 23. There is no discussion of limitations of this study. This needs to be addressed. 24. Having patients participate in physical therapy is a confounding factor for improvement after RF. If RF decreased pain, patients could participate better in physical therapy. This limitation needs to be discussed. 25. Conclusion: It mentions there were no significant complications, yet this was not mentioned at all in the results previously. This needs to be addressed in the results, and even minor complications should be discussed. 26. References: Reference 22 and 25 are both cited in the article for references regarding hip pain, but both articles are about lumbar-based procedures. This is incorrect use of a reference and other resources should be used to justify the authors points. <p>There is no mention of consent of the subjects or going through any type of institutional review board</p>	

Review Form 3

	prior to the application of the procedures.	
--	---	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	James B. Meiling
Department, University & Country	United States of America