

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 89666

Title: Significant improvement after sensory tricks and trunk strength training for Parkinson's disease with antecollis and camptocormia: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02445870

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Lecturer

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Mexico

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-11-08

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-23 15:49

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-27 20:27

Review time: 4 Days and 4 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The case report by Wang OT, and Hu Y., is interesting and related to a subject of great importance in modern medicine. I have some suggestions: 1. Tables and videos could be eliminated and briefly described in the text. 2. The lines “as a case report and literature review” (title) as well as “. To the best of our knowledge this is ...” (P1,p2,L3-4) are irrelevant in the era of internet, they should be deleted. 3. The subtitles 2, 2.1, 2.2 and 2.4 are odd in an academic publication. 4. The text could be shortened considerably: videos contents could be briefly described and deleted. 5. Despite the title this is not a review since the report of a unique or singular case was not reported previously; thus, a literature review would be inconsistent with a case report; 38 references document the features of this case but do not constitute a literature review of similar features of Parkinson cases. 6. The Discussion (P13-16) and Conclusions adequately describe the relevance of this case. 7. The last line of Conclusion should be clarified; rather than “the experiment”, I think that the authors plan to recruit more patients to conduct a “clinical study”.