

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_104844
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness of Combined Modified Constraint-Induced Movement Therapy and Mirror Therapy on Upper Limb Performance in Patients with Sub-acute Stroke: A Systematic Review
Type of the Article	

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>1. The article is devoted to an actual problem – THE STROKE, which is a fairly common cause of death and leads to disability, that requires the development and improvement of various methods of rehabilitation. There are different approaches to rehabilitation and (mCIMT), mirror therapy is one of them.</p> <p>2. The title is not enough suitable. Alternative title is: The effects of Combined Modified Constraint-Induced Movement Therapy and Mirror Therapy in Patients with Stroke according to various authors.</p> <p>3. Yes, it is.</p> <p>4. Yes, it is.</p> <p>5. No, because: the number of works is not enough to conduct a detailed scientific analysis. The title indicates a subacute stroke, but in the literature sources there are different options and different localizations; various options for combining rehabilitation methods are also mentioned. The effectiveness must be proven by some quantitative indicators. As presented, the article does not convince of the effectiveness.</p> <p>6. The references are not sufficient.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, it is.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The article should be supplemented and expanded, the remarks of paragraph 5 should be taken into account, and the tasks should be formulated more precisely: objects of study and comparison, specific objective facts confirming the effectiveness of this therapy and its advantages over other methods. The bibliography should be expanded.	

PART 2:

	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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Petrova Nataliya
Department, University & Country	I. P. Pavlov First St. Petersburg State Medical University, Russia