

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 25080

Title: Attitudes and diagnostic practice in low back pain: A qualitative study amongst Greek and British physiotherapists

Reviewer's code: 03596405

Reviewer's country: Australia

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-02-23 13:48

Date reviewed: 2016-03-17 16:57

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Please refer to the attached document.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 25080

Title: Attitudes and diagnostic practice in low back pain: A qualitative study amongst Greek and British physiotherapists

Reviewer's code: 00458932

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-02-23 13:48

Date reviewed: 2016-03-17 17:46

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is of interest. However, there are few points the authors should consider: (1).Number of British Pts=29, rather small. (2) The authors should commend on quationnaire No 1.9 and 3.1. Question No 1.9. I pay attention to doctor's diagnosis 42% by greek PTs 97% by british PTs, and No 3.1 diagnosis is a doctor's privilege. Answer by Greek PTs 91% by British PTs 17%. While British PTs have consistency in their answers, Greek PTs not. (3). The authors should avoid long sentences. Some sentences also require rephrasing. (4) Refs No 24, 61, are incomplete (5) In abstract: 42.6% of Greek PTs; in the Procedure: the likert scale: -neither agree nor disagree-

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 25080

Title: Attitudes and diagnostic practice in low back pain: A qualitative study amongst Greek and British physiotherapists

Reviewer's code: 00492417

Reviewer's country: South Korea

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-02-23 13:48

Date reviewed: 2016-03-20 18:11

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors In this manuscript, the authors conducted a cross-cultural survey to observe current diagnostic practice and attitudes of Greek and UK physiotherapists (PTs) on assessing low back pain (LBP) patients. Author's conclusions were that although similarities on history taking methods were detected across both Greek and UK groups, gross differences were found in re-assessment procedures and diagnostic issues between Greek and British physiotherapists. This topic is small, but informative one for those who are involved in this area. However some points should be supplemented or discussed. 1. You would be better to report the reason why you reported the results of two countries but not other countries. Why UK than others? 2. Approach. For in page 7 -> Approach. For... 3. Data analysis in page 10, Why did you not conduct statistical analysis in table 1 and 2? You can present your results about the difference between Greek and UK by using Chi-square test. Why not? There seemed statistical differences in sex, type of work between two groups in table 1. If so, several differences might have a chance to come from the unbalance of sex and type of work, but not by Greek and UK differences. It was not fully analyzed by statistical



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

analysis. 4. In your Discussion section in page 11-15, please add what are merits of your research or what is limitation of yours. 5. Conclusions in page 15-16. - Conclusions seemed little a bit lengthy even repetition of results and discussion. Thank you.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 25080

Title: Attitudes and diagnostic practice in low back pain: A qualitative study amongst Greek and British physiotherapists

Reviewer's code: 02281177

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-02-23 13:48

Date reviewed: 2016-03-06 13:30

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

There is some interest in the manuscript. I think that its significance in the culture exceeds that in the science. Throughout the full text, there are a lot of grammar and syntax errors which need to be revised by authors.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 25080

Title: Attitudes and diagnostic practice in low back pain: A qualitative study amongst Greek and British physiotherapists

Reviewer's code: 00501340

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-02-23 13:48

Date reviewed: 2016-03-07 03:13

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The following comments are intended for the benefit of the authors in revising their manuscript: Lines should be inserted in the manuscript Abstract: In the abstract there is a brief explanation of the content of the manuscript giving an informative overview. Main text: analysis of the current concepts on low back pain Methods: Good methodology. The authors explain explicitly the sample group as well as the procedure followed by the authors and the data analysis Results: Good presentation and analysis of the results in both countries (Greece and UK) Discussion: In the discussion field there is well presented juxtaposition between the results of the specific study and other similar studies. A little more emphasis should be given in the limitations of the study. Conclusion: The conclusion gives shortly the main idea of the study focusing on the differences noticed between the two countries. In general, this is a well-presented study on the low back pain physiotherapy and it provides useful information to the readers.