

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_76693
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF PHYSIOTHERAPY ON HAND REHABILITATION IN ACUTE ISCHEMIC STROKE SURVIVOR: A CASE REPORT
Type of the Article	Case study

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>

Review Form 1.6

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	<p>This is an important case study to raise awareness of importance of early physiotherapy rehabilitation in Ischemic Stroke. The paper is generally well structured. However, in my opinion the Title of the paper is relatively confusing because of the words "Early Hand rehabilitation". When you read a title, you would expect to review about "Hand Rehabilitation". But there are only two sentences mentioned about "Hand rehabilitation" in abstract and for the whole manuscript, authors didn't mention and discuss anything about 'hand rehabilitation'. If the authors intended to report this case study as "Early Rehabilitation", I suggested to update either "Early Physiotherapy Intervention" or "Early Rehabilitation". That will give reader to have more clear expectations regarding the case study.</p> <p>Also, the paper has some shortcomings regarding the presentation of findings in the result and discussion section. And authors could have discussed better according to this bibliography review of literature and made clear and constructive suggestions. I also strongly suggested to do the language and grammatical check for the whole paper. I put line numbers to navigate the comments.</p> <p>Introduction: <i>page 2, line 31 (first paragraph of the Introduction)</i>→ the authors might want to list the different types of strokes and explain the Ischemic stroke. I'd suggest put a brief description (in a few words) to the rest type of strokes, then the readers will have more clear idea.</p> <p>It is good that authors mentioned the types of strokes, affected area, risks and complications in the introduction. However, I would suggest to add information about "Hand Physiotherapy Treatment" to introduction as it is important to provide related background information for the content that will be the main part of this manuscript later.</p> <p>Patient Information: <i>Page 3, line 56</i> → "Hand grip was affected" which hand? Right or left?</p> <p>Clinical Findings: <i>Page 4, line 67</i>→ "On observation of limb..." This sentence isn't clear, need to be rewritten clearly. I suggest to present the clinical findings in bullet points, so findings will be more organized and easier to understand.</p> <p>Intervention: Regarding Interventions, authors might need to provide more information. For example, mentioning detail prescriptions with number of repetitions, durations and the time period for each form of exercises or positioning.</p> <p>For the point 3 in the intervention (<i>line 88</i>) → does author means that Modified Constraint-Induced Therapy was started once the patients regain her mobility in her wrist and fingers? If yes, could you please edit the sentence a bit, so the readers can understand easily.</p> <p>Follow up and outcomes: <i>page 5, line 94</i> → Authors should provide a brief description for each assessment tools (unless authors targeted the audience with the same background knowledge).</p> <p><i>Page 5, line 94</i> → "Tremendous improvement" What does it mean? How could a reader know that patient has improved? Any assessment results comparison before and after intervention?</p> <p>Result: I suggest to update the result session as it provided only general information from this case study. The authors should mention the detail clinical findings of improvement in this session.</p> <p>Discussion: In Discussion session, authors only mentioned about other studies' findings regarding "Walking as impairment and ability to work after stroke". The authors should relate to their case study findings to previous studies and should discuss how literature either support or against their findings in terms of walking ability after stroke.</p> <p><i>Page 6, line 105</i> → These sentences might need to add more information to have an idea what author is trying to say.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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> There are no ethical issues need to be raised.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Phyu Hnin Hlaing
Department, University & Country	Mahidol University, United Arab Emirates