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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
GOOD paper well written good number of patients included this was mentioned as retrospective study the data regarding the arthroscopic measurements were done by a probe - was all the information obtained from the records were the measurements done through 1 or 2 portals (to assess both dimensions) mention the standard technique used for all patients was the arthroscopic capsular release done for all patients what were the indications please mention the clinical and functional outcome and the duration of follow up This would be very useful and the discussion has to be modified accordingly.
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