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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

An interesting study, valuable too.

INTRODUCTION
1. you have a few studies described here and have discussed their conclusions. Instead can you use the most relevant and strongest (methodological) evidence available? This adds to your credibility
2. reference the study in the introduction section, the one where you state 'last year...
3. where you describe AC treatment, tell the audience the evidence for the other treatments that you have included in your studies.

METHOD
1. state in the first part of the method where from you obtained ethical approval for the study
2. I don't think you have handled your dropouts in the best way - excluding those who didn't do their programme every day or who missed appointments, and then also omitting their age and gender matched subject in the other groups. Many journals use an intention to treat analysis, you would be able to use this method, making your research feel more honest and open about the results.
3. you can perform a post-hoc power analysis to determine the strength of your findings
4. can you justify your use of your chosen statistics eg was their distribution normal, I saw some varied standard deviations - please check and include in your manuscript.

Minor Essential Revisions

In the manuscript you have used terms by their acronym, their full name and by slightly different acronyms, eg AC, adhesive capsulitis, idiopathic adhesive capsulitis. Use uniform terms. I have marked these in your manuscript (attached)

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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