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Design: Randomized controlled trial?

Objective: To assess the differences in range of motion and pain before and after manipulation under anesthesia in patients with frozen shoulder.

Reasons not to cite as evidence:

- Several outcomes are reported: Visual Analog Scale (VAS) for pain at rest and pain during activity, and three outcomes measuring range of motion (ROM) (abduction, external and internal rotation), and follow-up measurements at 1, 6, and 12 weeks.
- The designation of a primary outcome was not clear.
- Several important indicators of study quality are absent from the report.
  - No designated control group. Only one intervention group.
  - Allocation concealment and assessor blinding was not necessary, since there was no control group.
  - The study failed to report who conducted the assessments for the outcome measurements.
  - The presentation of the outcome data was brief, sketchy, and insufficient. P values in the tables were reported as 0.000.
  - An example of results that were presented; “After one week of the procedure, ROM was increased (p<0.05) compared with the pre-procedure level.”
- This study was incorrectly indexed by Pub Med as a randomized clinical trial.
- There were too many issues to make any evidence recommendations and the article is not only unsuitable for citation as evidence, but it is unsuitable for citation as information.