

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORR_79122
Title of the Manuscript:	Management of De Quervain tenosynovitis
Type of the Article	Minireview 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.journalajorr.com/index.php/AJORR/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>The title is unclear and needs to be more precise and informative for any clear message.</p> <p>This being a retrospective study design can be considered as an original article rather than a minireview.</p> <p>The aim of the article is not matching with the study design.</p> <p>The abstract is lengthy and relevant details for results in abstract and the text included in outcome section are repetitions. Kindly rectify and rephrase the abstract.</p> <p>The manuscript lacks keywords.</p> <p>The article lacks in use of recent reports available in literature as the reference which is 2019 dated is the latest reference used and no reference beyond 2019 has been used. For a minireview article, kindly consider latest references for inclusion as references.</p> <p>The introduction lacks any referencing which is unusual and can be better referenced to make a relevant study.</p> <p>There is a lack of understanding from the methodology to suggest what kind of Dequarvain's tenosynovitis patient are being considered as study subjects. Needs clarification. The inclusion and exclusion criteria for the study population are not defined with a clear message which can be replicated by other researchers. The criteria listed lacked clarity, prone to bias in author selection and does not offer any details for inclusion except for the statement that non-responders have been included.</p> <p>There is no mention of any risk factors which may compromise the results either medical or surgical reasons and needs understanding in clinicopathological profile of the study group.</p> <p>There is no mention on strategic steps used in deciding the type of technique used for release. How the authors selected a patient for longitudinal or transverse incision? Are there two study groups in the study design?</p> <p>The article lacks tables which can be considered to be presented for comparative analysis with other studies.</p> <p>The article lacks any figures which can be considered to be presented for better representation of the technique used and clinical images of results obtained for better understanding of the outcomes.</p> <p>The discussion included description of different study results which can be tabulated for better understanding.</p> <p>The topic on dequervains tenosynovitis management is a well-researched subject with review and meta-analysis articles available to provide evidence-based suggestions. Kindly check. Few suggestions are "De Quervain's Tenosynovitis: A Systematic and Citation Network Analysis Review (biomedres.us)".</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>“Deepak Nainwal (MPT) and R. Arunmozhi (2020); A LITERATURE REVIEW ON DE-QUERVAINS TENOSYNOVITIS <i>Int. J. of Adv. Res.</i> 8 (Jul). 824-835] (ISSN 2320-5407). www.journalijar.com”.</p> <p>De Quervain Tenosynovitis - StatPearls - NCBI Bookshelf (nih.gov).</p> <p>The manuscript has innumerable grammatical errors which needs thorough language editing for better interpretation.</p> <p>The study is retrospective in nature and does not elaborate on the limitations. Needs clarification</p> <p>The conclusion does not match with the title.</p> <p>Overall the manuscript is suggested for revision.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
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:	Gaurav Govil
Department, University & Country	Max Super Specialty Hospital, India