

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_76090
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFICACY OF BILATERAL LOWER LIMB TRAINING OVER UNILATERAL TO RE-EDUCATE BALANCE AND WALKING IN POST-STROKE SURVIVORS: A PROTOCOL FOR RANDOMIZED CLINICALTRIAL
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

	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>The article proposes a protocol about bilateral lower limb training in subacute stroke. Authors remake the importance of bilateral treatment, let us not forget that the pyramids decussation occurs in 85% (approximately) so there is a 15% of the contralateral side that is also affected. For that reason, bilateral training would be the best alternative treatment for the full recovery of these patients.</p> <p>"d side": is it correct or what it is exactly means? "to determine the sample size, that is 20 samples in each group": there is an only sample, with 20 individuals in each group. Correct it. Are there any exclusion criteria? Have you considering how to analyze potential loss of the sample during the study implementation?</p> <p>Both treatments should be deeply explained: MRP and FNP more than the timing and the frequency. Because there is no mention about FNP. It could be convenient that you explain more the variables and, you must add the validation reference of these variables you are going to use. If group A has "double" training, may the treatment last longer? Because both treatments have the same duration: 20 min.</p> <p>Has the study a committee approval?</p> <p>Writing: revise, there is a lot of words written together, I do not know if it is an editing mistake or if there are incorrectly written together. Please, revise it.</p> <p>Reference style should be revised too, sometimes the reference number is close to the previous word and others there is a space between them. Some references are not correctly written (example: 9, 11, 12...) correct them please.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>In the abstract: "MRP" and "PNF"; although we may know what it means, the reader may not, so it would be convenient to write it in full the first time it is mentioned and then the corresponding abbreviation. "ADL": same comment. Explain it in full. In the previous paragraph than the final introduction paragraph, it was explained in full MRP acronym, you should explain it before. "OPD and IPD of RNPC and AVBRH": acronyms should be explained in full the first time you used it. "MCA stroke": same comment.</p> <p>In the study procedure you don't use the acronym "MRP". If you want to use an acronym you should use it in all entire manuscript. Please follow the same format.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Inés Llamas-Ramos
Department, University & Country	University of Salamanca, Spain