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Reviewer's report:

In this protocol for the shoulder adhesive capsulitis biomarker study (AdCaB), the authors wish to get needed information regarding the pathogenesis, diagnosis and staging of adhesive capsulitis (AC). The authors also wish to compare the clinical outcomes between arthroscopic release of AC and arthroscopic surgery for shoulder inability. The topic is interesting, but there are some points to be addressed.

1. Background, Lines 50-53
   The pathology features of AC are inflamed glenohumeral and subacromial synovium

   METHODS AND ANALYSIS, Lines 60
   No evidence of arthropathy or full thickness rotator cuff tear on bloods and MRI. It seemed that the authors also enrolled the patients with tendinopathy or incomplete tearing of the rotator cuff. Did these patients belong to secondary AC group?

2. To compare the differential gene expressions between shoulder stiffness or AC and shoulder instability is meaningful. However, it dose not make much sense to compare the clinical outcomes between two different procedures for two different disorders (AC and instability).

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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