

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>)

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes 2. No – what is the authors' intention to say “Quasi Experimental” - should be removed 3. Yes 4. Yes 5. N/A – Needs modification 6. No – Missing citation</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Thank you for your important clinical research study in dysphagia. The idea of the study and research questions are great.</p> <p>There might be some issues in your manuscripts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abstract: It would be kind If you could spell out an abbreviation at the first appearance (SEMG). • Introduction: On page 4 of the manuscript, no citation for 'van de Port IG et al (2007).' • Methodology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What do you mean by “Quasi Experiment” of your study? ○ What was the time point of the experimental intervention after the stroke attack (ex. acute, subacute, chronic)? ○ There is no localization description regarding the brain damage due to stroke, which suggests prognosis of dysphagia. For example, involvement of the bilateral cortico-pyramidal tracts causes prolonging dysphagia; on the other hand, dysphagia from unilateral cortical lesion recovers well in the natural course even if the lesion volume is not small. ○ Was the experimental intervention provided, in addition to the conventional therapy? If so, the better outcomes may be due to a dose effect of the therapy intervention. Is there any control intervention for the control group? 	

[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:	Mari Tobita
Department, University & Country	Rancho Los Amigos National Rehabilitation Center, USA