ISSN: 2320-5407
International Journal of Advanced Research
Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP
www.journalijar.com
ISSN NO. 2320-5407

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR- 51182 Date: 21/04/2025

Title: Efficacy of Analgesics and Physiotherapy Versus Local Steroid Injections in the Management of Tennis Elbow: A Prospective Observational Study of 100 Patients

Recommendation:
✓ Accept as it is .....
Accept after minor revision.....
Accept after major revision .....
Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance		✓		

Reviewer Name: Dr. S. K. Nath Date: 22/04/2025

Reviewer's Comment for Publication:
The study presents valuable insights into the management of lateral epicondylitis. Both treatment modalities—analgesics with physiotherapy and local steroid injections—demonstrated significant improvements in pain and function in patients over 12 months. However, while steroid injections offered rapid pain relief, the long-term functional outcomes converged between the two groups, emphasizing the importance of a balanced, individualized treatment approach. The findings highlight a need for further research, particularly randomized controlled trials with longer follow-ups, to better understand the nuances of treatment efficacy and optimize patient care strategies.

Reviewer's Comment / Report

Strengths:
1. **Prospective Design**: This study utilizes a prospective observational design, allowing for real-time data collection and analysis, which enhances the reliability of the findings.
2. **Comprehensive Outcome Measures**: The use of multiple outcome measures, such as the Patient Rated Tennis Elbow Evaluation (PRTEE) and visual analog scales (VAS), alongside objective functional assessments (grip strength, range of motion), provides a detailed insight into the treatment effectiveness.
3. **Heterogeneous Cohort**: The inclusion of patients with a variety of backgrounds (age, sex, occupation) enhances the generalizability of the findings to a broader population.
4. **Longitudinal Follow-up**: With assessments conducted at multiple time points (baseline, 6 weeks, 3 months, 6 months, 9 months, and 12 months), the study captures both short-term and long-term outcomes, offering a comprehensive view of the treatment efficacy.

Weaknesses:
1. **Observational Design**: While the study is prospective, the lack of randomization may introduce selection bias, limiting the ability to definitively attribute differences in outcomes to the interventions alone.
2. **Single-Center Study**: Conducting the study at a single institution may decrease the external validity and applicability of the results to other settings or populations.
3. **Short Follow-up Duration**: Although 12 months is a robust follow-up period, it may not be sufficient to fully capture long-term outcomes and the potential for late recurrences of symptoms.
4. **Lack of Control Group**: Without a control group for comparison, it is difficult to ascertain if improvements are solely due to the interventions or other factors.