

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_76952
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Interactive, Virtual Tele-Physiotherapy for Improving Motor Function and Quality of Life in Stroke Patients: A Study Protocol
Type of the Article	Study Protocol

### **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**

	<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	<p>Thanks the authors for writing up the protocol and setting up this meaningful studies.</p> <p>Although simple randomization is planned to be used in this study, investigators analysing the data are not blinded, at least not mentioned in the study protocol. To improve the quality of this randomized controlled trial (RCT), investigators and physiotherapists are better to be blinded when blinding of subjects are impossible. Please mention the full term of abbreviations upon their first appearance in the text, e.g. mRS, OPD</p> <p>In page 10, line 7, independent Student's <i>t</i>-test was used to compare the pre and post results, it would be better to use paired <i>t</i>-test as it's a pre post comparison. Please add in checking of normal distribution of data in the protocol, e.g. Shapiro-Wilk test given its small sample size. Because the ANOVA and <i>t</i>-test mentioned are both parametric tests which only applicable with normally distributed data. Given the sample size of just 20 in each group, normal distribution may not be the case usually.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>References were cited in different formats despite only 9 were present. More references should be added to strengthen this RCT.</p> <p>Please add in citation of "Au SCL. Revisiting the Role of Telemedicine Under the 2019 Novel Coronavirus Outbreak. Eur J Geriatr Gerontol 2020;2(1):26-27" in page 4 line 17 for Telehealth</p> <p>Please add in citation of "Au SCL. A surge in eye clinic nonattendance under 2019 novel coronavirus outbreak. <i>Indian J Ophthalmol.</i> 2020;68(5):948. doi:10.4103/ijo.IJO_673_20" in page 5 line 7-8 for barriers</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>I would suggest adding RCT into the title of the study to reflect its true nature.</p>	

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>

Review Form 1.6

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Sunny, Chi Lik Au</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Tung Wah Eastern Hospital, China</b>