

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_100852
Title of the Manuscript:	Can We Improve Clinical Outcomes and Patient Engagement after TKA Using a Digital Health Remote Monitoring Platform? Perioperative Results with Recupe
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The topic of the manuscript is of interest for the scientific community. However, its quality at this stage is insufficient as to be considered useful.</p> <p>Not really. The title as well as the conclusions suggest that there is a tool which is evaluated for improving the rehabilitation treatment, which is not really what the tool is being used for</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive, however, the conclusion presented in the abstract is not supported by the results reported in the paper.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>There is insufficient information as to evaluate the scientific correctness of the paper. Much more information in the Introduction, Methods and Results sections should be provided and the Discussion and conclusion should be written based on the results reported.</p> <p>The references are recent but insufficient.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>A throughout revision of the language should be performed.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I believe that this manuscript in the present form is not suitable yet for publication. I provide with some comments as an aid for improving it.</p> <p>In the abstract, the sentence: "Previous research showed non-compliance at up to 70%." Should be rewritten</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>1) As the article aims at improving the adherence to home physical therapy, it should state as clear as possible, the limitations and problems that the lack of adherence may bring. The sentence: "This non-compliance can lead to complications such as decreased knee flexion and disability, leading to additional procedures, such as manipulation under anesthesia and joint revisions. (4,5)" is not appropriate in this case" is not enough to present the case. First, because the references only provide information regarding the complications of new surgeries, but not on the complications of lack of adherence. And second, the complications of lack of adherence should be clearly stated. The authors should answer the following questions: "What happens if the patients does not comply with the expected exercises? And in particular, what happens with Range of motion and pain?"</p> <p>2) In the sentence, " A previous study demonstrated 27% knee flexion ROM gains after two weeks, and 50% at the beginning of 6 weeks for patients receiving medical treatments. (7)", does the treatment involve home rehab? If so, then it seems that with a low adherence, the results are good enough.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>3) In the sentence: "Coaches also train and motivate the patients." How is that achieved?</p> <p>Methods</p> <p>All the methods section is poorly described. Much more information should be provided, so that a clear idea of the methods used is reported to the reader.</p> <p>Some examples are:</p> <p>4) The participants and the recruitment mechanism should be explained:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. In the sentence: We filtered out patients who had adherence less than three times a week, adherence defined as any activity. What do the authors mean? Adherence to what?b. Duration less than 40 days: duration of what exactly?c. Engagement less than 50% of days: engagement to what? <p>5) The sentence "All of the patients were group health patients from Orthopedic clinics." Needs grammar revision.</p> <p>6) What is Plethy? (a company, a university). More data is required (including but no only, type of company, address, etc).</p> <p>7) The app should be further explained, and possibly figures showing its interface should be added. What type of data does the user include? Are the exercise explained within the app? Should the app be open after doing the exercises? A full description of the app is needed.</p> <p>8) The methods to measure pain, ROM and engagement should be clearly stated. What is the scale use for measuring pain? Is it validated? When are the patient instructed to report their pain level? (before the exercises, on a daily basis, after the exercises, any day, any time, when they feel like doing it?)</p> <p>9) Same level of details should be provided for measurement of range of motion</p> <p>10) Same level of details should be provided for measurement of engagement.</p> <p>11) More details about the exercise program should be provided: how is the program presented to the patients (through the app, separately, in person when they visit the clinic)? How regularly are they instructed to do the exercise? For how long?</p> <p>Results:</p> <p>Results should be provided in tables as well as figures. Data from individual patients (or at least some representative ones could be of help to see more clearly the results).</p> <p>Discussion and conclusion</p> <p>12) The statement: This study suggests that digital health can help keep patients engaged in their home exercises is not supported by the results provided.</p> <p>The data showed an improvement in ROM and pain levels. Nothing would suggest that these changes were cause because of using this (or other particular) tool.</p> <p>To measure if the tool improved the engagement, a control group should be used.</p>	
--	---	--

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Paola Catalfamo
Department, University & Country	Universidad Nacional de Entre Ríos, Argentina