



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRIMPS_43999</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A RANDOMIZED CLINICAL STUDY TO DETERMINE THE EFFICACY OF QUADRICEPS MUSCLE STRENGTHENING EXERCISES AND INFRARED RADIATION THERAPY IN THE MANAGEMENT OF SYMPTOMATIC OSTEOARTHRITIS OF THE KNEE IN A SOUTH- EASTERN NIGERIAN POPULATION.</b>
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://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	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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>Justification for the study.</p> <p>RCT STUDY NOT REGISTERED</p> <p>Faulty Methodology</p> <p>Data analysis</p>	<p><b>The argument for the need of the study lack merits and therefore, those not warrant duplication of information already known and established.</b></p> <p><b>According to the CONSORT, 2010 reporting guideline all studies must be registered and has ethical approval with its identification number stated. Its reporting guideline must also be followed.</b></p> <p><b>There is a faulty methodology in the study as unethical to deny patients with treatments that have been found effective because you are carrying out a study. This is not acceptable. See Helsinki declaration.</b></p> <p><b>The data analysis was wrong as there was already significant difference in the anthropometrics of participant between the 2 groups and this was not controlled for in the analysis. It means all the results obtained could have been due to difference in the group prior to intervention.</b></p> <p><b>Ethical issue:</b> Yes No any ethical approval identity was mentioned for confirmation as placebo was used which is not allowed according to the Helsinki declaration.</p>	<p>In research, we are aware that findings from other population can be applied in our population. As far as we know this study is new to our population and race and that is enough novelty needed to publish the information for our application and references.</p> <p>This is a trial intervention and we are sure Helsinki declaration did not say we should not do research thus it cannot be unethical to use placebo because participants duly consented to partake in the trial. Several literature had also demonstrated the use of placebo in clinical trials.</p> <p>Because of the sampling technique used for this study, the subjects could not be <b>anthropometrically</b> matched. However closely looking at the subjects in both groups, patients in the control groups had even lower BMI than those in the treatment group and thus were in 'advantage'. Also, kindly look at other variables. Secondly what is actually important is the effect of the intervention on the subjects at the end of the intervention and these were revealed in the result.</p> <p>We have attached Ethical approval letter and reference number, at the moment in Nigeria RCT are permitted by Institutional ethical review board and they are assigned number for reference purpose. The reference number serves as registration of trial. The Health research council of the Federal ministry of health over sees that and it can comfortably serve for any central database registration for RCT.</p>
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<p><b>No flow chart of study characteristics.</b></p> <p>Discussion</p>	<p>This will show the sample size and its calculation, how participants were recruited, how many dropped out and for what reason as well as indicating groups and intervention they had. Finally, the total number that was analysed.</p> <p>The discussion section did not capture the effect in the difference anthropometric characteristics of participant as relates to their findings. This makes the findings not valid. No any new information that the discussion raised from the findings.</p>	<p><b>This was addressed in the revised manuscript.</b></p> <p><b>This was addressed in the revised manuscript.</b></p>
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments			