



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Neurology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORRIN_43528
Title of the Manuscript:	Bobath versus Proprioceptive Neuromuscular Facilitation in retraining of balance and Functional Independence in Activities of Daily Living
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

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>)

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	1. Authors should show how the sample size of 50 was determined; Sample size formula should also be stated 2. How were the participants assigned to the two groups? 3. A study of this nature should have a flow chat 4. Authors should state the research hypothesis 'null or alternate' and state whether it was rejected or accepted 5. The duration of each intervention was not stated by the authors 6. Authors should state the stroke subtypes prevalent in the study population 7. The inclusion criteria should indicate the age range of participants 8. The stroke duration range (acuteness or chronicity) of participants should be stated 9. Authors were silent on obtaining consent from participants. It should be stated in the manuscript. 10. Did the authors use research assistants? If yes what role did they play? If no why ? 11. Revise (3) to read [3] to be in uniform with the others 12. Line 33, revise 'amount' to read ' amounts' 13. Line 77, revise 'Health Research and ethic committee' to read 'Health Research and Ethic Committee' 14. Line 214, revise 'efficacious PNF' to read 'efficacious than PNF'	A total sample size of 46 (23 per group) was obtained using large effect size of 1.0 at $\beta=0.9$, $\alpha=0.05$ 0.90 (Cohen, 1988). Participants were conveniently allocated into treatment groups. This is due to the natural difference in baseline functional requirements between the two interventions. It was therefore necessary to determine participants' functional level before treatment, and allocate them with intervention in view. This difference was as narrow as possible. This is shown by the fact that participants for Bobath were, on average, just a step below those which received PNF. We acknowledge that this difference in functional requirements between the interventions weakens conclusions regarding their comparison. Attempt was however made to minimize this bias by calculating, for each participant, the post-treatment functional gain. More-so, since the PNF and Bobath groups were, on average, minimally dependent and partial dependents respectively, the two groups are comparable. We acknowledge the importance of flow chat in relaying information on follow-up process, level of attrition as well as method of analysis adopted. However, the fact that no flow chart was associated with this from the beginning makes it difficult for one to be drawn. There was no record of the events that should characterize a flow chat. Null hypothesis was stated during the conception of this study, and this was rejected. We have revised the manuscript to reflect this. The duration of each intervention was not taken. This is because, physiotherapy is an art as much as it is a science; patients differed in their cooperation, response to instruction and treatment. They were thoroughly treated taking their individuality and personality into consideration; hence it was difficult to time the interventions.



SDI Review Form 1.6

		Regarding subtypes of stroke and duration of stroke, we acknowledge their omission as limitations to the outcome of the study, and the manuscript has been appropriately revised. We have revised the inclusion criteria to include participants' age range. Thank you for pointing out this omission, we have included statements on informed consent. Research assistants were not used since the study variables were not too numerous. Also, that the study was self-funded limited any tendency to employ research assistant(s). '(3)' have been revised to read '[3]' 'amount' has been revised to read ' amounts' 'Health Research and ethic committee' has been revised to read 'Health Research and Ethic Committee' 'efficacious PNF' has been revised to read 'efficacious than PNF'
eMinor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The study is interesting but the differences in baseline scores, the short duration of intervention and the small sample size weakens the outcome.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	