

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_129261
Title of the Manuscript:	Longitudinal Assessment and Comparison of Functional Mobility in Patients Undergoing Unilateral Knee Arthroplasty with Two Types of Prostheses Using the Timed Up and Go (TUG) Test: A Pilot and Preliminary Study
Type of the Article	

#### General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

#### PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript is highly significant for the scientific community as it provides a detailed comparative analysis of functional mobility in patients undergoing unilateral knee arthroplasty with two distinct prosthesis types: fixed tibial plateau and rotating platform. The use of the Timed Up and Go (TUG) test with advanced inertial sensors enables the evaluation of nuanced changes in functional mobility parameters over time. By exploring the similarities and differences between prostheses, the study highlights advancements in surgical technology and rehabilitation approaches. Additionally, the emphasis on objective measurements alongside subjective assessments addresses existing gaps in the literature and paves the way for more comprehensive postoperative evaluations.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title of the article, "Longitudinal Assessment and Comparison of Functional Mobility in Patients Undergoing Unilateral Knee Arthroplasty with Two Types of Prostheses Using the Timed Up and Go (TUG) Test: A Pilot and Preliminary Study," is descriptive but may be too lengthy and complex. It could benefit from being more concise while still conveying the study's scope and focus.  Suggested Alternative Title:  "Functional Mobility Assessment After Unilateral Knee Arthroplasty: A Comparative Study of Two Prosthesis Types"	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	<b>Suggestions for Improvement:</b>  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Highlight : Include a sentence on how this study fills a gap in existing literature or its contributions.</li> <li>2. Balance Details: While the results section is detailed, some findings (e.g., statistical insignificance in most variables) could be summarized more succinctly to make room for discussing broader implications.</li> <li>3. Clarify the Context: Explicitly mention why the comparison between fixed and rotating platform prostheses is clinically significant.</li> <li>4. Future Directions: Consider adding a sentence on how the findings can influence clinical practice or future research.</li> <li>5. Simplify the Conclusion: The abstract could conclude with a more impactful statement about the study's implications rather than focusing heavily on statistical outcomes.</li> </ol>	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript is scientifically correct but could be improved by:  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Discussing the implications of the small sample size on the reliability of findings.</li> <li>2. Providing stronger links between quantitative results and clinical applications.</li> <li>3. Suggesting potential modifications to improve the study's power and applicability in future research.</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>Suggested Additional References:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Wearable Technology in Gait Analysis:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Aminian, K., &amp; Najafi, B. (2022). Capturing human motion: Lessons from wearable sensors. <i>IEEE Sensors Journal</i>, 22(2), 1537–1550. [This could enhance the discussion on the benefits of using inertial sensors.]</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Recent Advances in Rehabilitation Post-Arthroplasty:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Wiegant, K., van Roermund, P. M., Intema, F., et al. (2020). Personalized rehabilitation after knee arthroplasty: A systematic review. <i>Journal of Orthopaedic &amp; Sports Physical Therapy</i>, 50(3), 151–159.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Subjective vs. Objective Measures:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Chen, H., &amp; Xiao, X. (2021). Subjective and objective measures in evaluating functional recovery after knee replacement. <i>Clinical Rehabilitation</i>, 35(6), 862–874.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	
<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sentence Structure:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Some sentences are overly long and complex, making them harder to read. For example:                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Original: "This study aims to evaluate and compare the functional mobility of patients undergoing unilateral knee arthroplasty with two types of prostheses using the Timed Up and Go (TUG) test."</li> <li>▪ Revised: "This study compares functional mobility in patients undergoing unilateral knee arthroplasty with fixed and rotating prostheses using the Timed Up and Go (TUG) test."</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Redundancy:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Certain phrases and ideas are repeated unnecessarily, especially in the introduction and results sections. Streamlining these could improve readability.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Word Choice:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Some words and phrases, while technically accurate, could be simplified for better clarity. For example:                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Replace "characterize functional mobility patterns" with "analyze mobility patterns."</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>4. Grammar and Syntax:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Minor grammatical issues, such as verb agreement and punctuation, can be refined. For example:                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Original: "The average TUG time increased from 14.47 ± 3.03 seconds to 15.24 ± 3.85 seconds, without statistical significance (P=.301)."</li> <li>▪ Revised: "The average TUG time increased from 14.47 ± 3.03 seconds to 15.24 ± 3.85 seconds but was not statistically significant (P=.301)."</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>5. Abstract Readability:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The abstract contains dense information that could benefit from more concise phrasing</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>The manuscript presents a well-structured, scientifically sound study on functional mobility following unilateral knee arthroplasty, comparing fixed and rotating platform prostheses. The study employs advanced methods (inertial sensors) and highlights the need for objective and subjective evaluation in postoperative recovery. However, some aspects could be refined to enhance its clarity, impact, and alignment with scholarly standards.</b></p>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<p><b>Name:</b></p>	<p><b>Varagani srinivasarao</b></p>
<p><b>Department, University &amp; Country</b></p>	<p><b>Viswabharathi super speciality hospital, NTR University of Health Sciences, India</b></p>