



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	2014_AIR_13607
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness of Physiotherapy in the improvement of the perception of quality of life in patients with hemophilia.A systematicreview.
Type of the Article	Review 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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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>In literature, there is an expressive body of research assessing the effectiveness of physiotherapeutic techniques (isolated or grouped) about the improvement of the symptoms inherent to hemophilic arthropathy. However, there are not enough clear evidences discussing the correlation between the improvement of the symptoms/functional loss resultant of physiotherapeutic intervention and the perception of improvement of these patients' quality of life. The revised manuscript clearly indicates an important gap in scientific literature. Nonetheless, some points should be adjusted.</p> <p>Introduction The introduction is concise and well-founded, in agreement with the study purpose.</p> <p>Methodology The manuscript attends satisfactorily to the methodological requisites of scientific research.</p> <p>Results The results could have been better detailed in the manuscript text. In my opinion, the writers should enrich the text by describing their findings listed in Chart #1, and not by only making reference to it.</p> <p>Discussion</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>The part of the text referring to the “Discussion” would have been better inserted in the “Results” section of the manuscript. As far as I am concerned, the “Discussion” should be a space destined to interpreting and not describing the results found. This space should be used for positioning, confrontation of ideas and comparisons with other published Works that approach relevant findings in literature. The “Limitations”, “Relevance of the study for clinic practice” and “Future research lines” are well placed. Therefore, I suggest no changes there.</p> <p>Conclusion There was an adequate statement of the central idea of the study and the relevant presented points.</p> <p>References The references are relevant, updated and appropriate to the theoretical fundamentals of the manuscript.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	State University of Campinas, Brazil