

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_105016
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFICACY OF FEEDBACK BASED THERAPY FOR DYSPHAGIA IN POST STROKE PATIENTS – QUASI EXPERIMENTAL STUDY.
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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	The Manuscript is important because it highlights that therapy protocol shows good improvement in post stroke patients with dysphagia Yes the title is suitable because the title is well explained by the author The abstract of the article is impressive The structure of the article is done effectively by the author Yes the manuscript is scientifically correct	The Manuscript have been well written and structured by the Author who have done deep research on the topic and have explained the topic very well.
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The Language seems good and its well written by the Author	
Optional/General comments	The Author though could have added few more pointers on the topic	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abhishek Srivastava
Department, University & Country	Alliance University, India