

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ Ms_AJORRIN_105741
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of dual-task specific training & conventional physiotherapeutic interventions in ambulation of left hemiplegic stroke patients; a randomized control trial
Type of the 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.journaljocamr.com/index.php/JOCAMR/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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Dear Editor,</p> <p>Thank you for the invite to review the manuscript "Comparison of dual-task specific training & conventional physiotherapeutic interventions in ambulation of left hemiplegic stroke patients; a randomized control trial" submitted to the Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Neurology.</p> <p>In this randomized clinical trial, the authors compared the effectiveness of dual-task training (DTT) to conventional physical therapy (PT) in 64 patients with left-sided hemiplegia evenly divided into two experimental groups (receiving DTT and control PT) in a single medical facility. The authors presented hypothesis and the goal of the study. The methods were adequate to support the authors' hypothesis and achieve the goal. The results revealed that the experimental group (DTT) improved significantly compared to the control group (PT). The discussion was inadequate and should be rewritten. The authors surprisingly concluded that both techniques improved the outcome despite significantly better results with using DTT compared to the PT group. The latter showed even slight deterioration in several tests.</p> <p>I recommend the manuscript for publication in the AJORRIN after it is corrected and the additional review.</p> <p>With my warmest regards,</p> <p>Ryszard</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Specific comments and minor flaws</p> <p>Abstract Please clarify if the patients recruited were consecutive. The patients in both groups were young compared with the usual ischemic stroke population. Please provide an explanation and justification.</p> <p>Methods Instead of introducing unnecessary new acronyms (TG, CG), the authors should consider using the well-established DTT and PT (or control group).</p> <p>Results Please reconcile the Results section with information presented in the Abstract section.</p> <p>Discussion The Discussion section was poorly organized, and difficult to follow. The authors should consider rewriting this part by dividing it into three parts devoted to PT, DTT, and comparison of both or concentrate only on the difference between DTT vs. PT groups. Please explain the term "quasi-experimental".</p> <p>Limitations Please, provide information how each limitation might have affected the results and the conclusion.</p> <p>Conclusion The conclusion was misleading because it suggested equivalence of the improvement in both groups of patients.</p> <p>Tables Please remove Table 1 as it did not contribute any new information to that presented in the text. Table 2. It was unclear why the P value in the first row was in bold.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	Misspelling, typographical, and grammatical errors need to be corrected. As the number of acronyms was overwhelming, not (or rarely) used acronyms should be removed.	
Optional/General comments	In this randomized clinical trial, the authors compared the effectiveness of dual-task training (DTT) to conventional physical therapy (PT) in 64 patients with left-sided hemiplegia evenly divided into two experimental groups (receiving DTT and control PT) in a single medical facility. The authors presented hypothesis and the goal of the study. The methods were adequate to support the authors' hypothesis and achieve the goal. The results revealed that the experimental group (DTT) improved significantly compared to the control group (PT). The discussion was inadequate and should be rewritten. The authors surprisingly concluded that both techniques improved the outcome despite significantly better results with using DTT compared to the PT group. The latter showed even slight deterioration in several tests.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ryszard Pluta
Department, University & Country	NIH, USA