

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_71126
Title of the Manuscript:	Post-Operative Physiotherapy Rehabilitation Program for a Patient with Tibial Osteosarcoma: A Case Report
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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Authors try to give case studies about Post-Operative Physiotherapy Rehabilitation Program for a Patient with Tibial Osteosarcoma.</li> <li>II. But authors did not try to find the specific findings of this case after physiotherapy intervention are generated with reference to previous studies.</li> <li>III. In the introduction nothing mentioned about post operative rehabilitation program.</li> <li>IV. Pre and post analysis not presented but in conclusion effectiveness of therapy mentioned.</li> <li>V. Also from a single case study generalization of inference mentioned. There is no synchronization between each section. Citation not mentioned properly.</li> <li>VI. Article to be reframed with proper sequential description.</li> <li>VII. Clarity and presentation of the paper is less adequate.</li> <li>VIII. Several typos and grammatical errors appear in the article.</li> <li>IX. Overall the paper shows less technical strength, transparency, intelligibility and significance of the paper title.</li> <li>X. Conclusion part should be more clear and prospective.</li> <li>XI. How the authors are clamming the improvement of function by managing health care and goal setting achieved the goal in the proper time period.</li> <li>XII. Reference list is adequate but citation in the text is not in proper format and some of the citations are unjustified introduced.</li> <li>XIII. Tables and Figures require proper format and more clarity in the text.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

## Review Form 1.6

### **PART 2:**

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

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Kshanaprava Mohakud</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Utkal University, India</b>