

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8701

Title: Progress in sensorimotor rehabilitative programs of physical therapy for stroke

Reviewer code: 02844358

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2014-01-03 20:24

Date reviewed: 2014-01-23 22:18

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

There are three main problems with the paper. First, the author propose conventional and advanced treatment methods of the neurorehabilitation for stroke patients. Could the author described the detailed criteria for defining the conventional and advanced neurorehabilitation methods that the readers can tell them different easily? Second, the authors indicated that most of the advanced neurorehabilitation techniques are based on neuroscience evidence rather than pragmatism The neuroplasticity and reorganization of cerebral cortex are accompanied by functional recovery of the stroke using functional brain images.Could the studies and evaluations for the conventional and advanced stroke neurorehabilitations use the same tool? Could the author present any evidence or paper described the compared effect of the conventional and advanced stroke neurorehabilitations ? Moreover, could the author present more evidences to support the suggestion of the concept of combining valuable rehabilitative programs, “a training package”, according to the patient’s functional status during different recovery phases after stroke since Finally, there is some concern that the authors have omitted several critical papers in the field. A search of ‘physical therapy’ and ‘stroke’ brings up at least 59 papers, at least two of which are relevant since they also review the stroke rehabilitation. 1. Dobkin BH, Dorsch A.:New evidence for therapies in stroke rehabilitation. Curr Atheroscler Rep. 2013 Jun;15(6):331. doi: 10.1007/s11883-013-0331- 2.Geroïn C, Mazzoleni S, Smania N, Gandolfi M, Bonaiuti D, Gasperini G, Sale P, Munari D, Waldner A, Spidalieri R, Bovolenta F, Picelli A, Posteraro F, Molteni F, Franceschini M; Italian Robotic Neurorehabilitation Research Group.Systematic review of outcome measures of walking training using



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: editorialoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

electromechanical and robotic devices in patients with stroke.J Rehabil Med. 2013 Nov;45(10):987-96. doi: 10.2340/16501977-123 Specific Comments Title The title is appropriate as written. Abstract & Keywords The Abstract appropriately summarizes the manuscript. It provides enough information necessary to understand the study and its conclusions while being concise at the same time. I suggest adding more statement regarding the synergistic effect of the conventional and advanced neurorehab treatment method as this finding is proposed by the author As stated previously, the Abstract would benefit from a thorough round of editing by a native English speaker, which would improve to clarity and readability overall. The Keywords are appropriate. Conclusions The conclusions are reasonable but a little bit brief Figures The Figures are easy to understand and the legends provide sufficient explanation. The authors should check the target journal guidelines as to how to handle defining abbreviations in Figures and legends. Tables I suggest adding more details of the Rationale component of the Table, if more differences can be provided. Otherwise, the Tables are appropriate and understandable.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8701

Title: Progress in sensorimotor rehabilitative programs of physical therapy for stroke

Reviewer code: 00646640

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2014-01-03 20:24

Date reviewed: 2014-03-02 03:56

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

GENERAL COMMENTS This review article tried to summarize all potential programs and to introduce a schematic program to maximize functional outcomes of stroke patients. A 'training package' concept is proposed for stroke patients with various severities in different phases using classic theory and recent gathering evidences on rehabilitation strategies. **SPECIFIC COMMENTS** Titled "progress in sensorimotor rehabilitative programs of physical therapy for stroke" is reflects the major topic and contents of the study. **Abstract:** It addressed stroke rehabilitation programs, conventional rehabilitation strategies and advanced strategies incorporated into classical rehabilitation. Integrated sensorimotor rehabilitation programs with appropriate temporal arrangements may lead to great functional benefit on stroke patients. **Materials, methods and results:** Authors may extend these topics to strengthen the manuscript other than just listed the therapies in both tables/figure 1 and in the text. There is detailed description but no any modified or novel methods have been addressed. For example, authors may use statistical methods (Meta-analysis) to highlight why some programs are better. **Discussion:** Well organized, systematically analyzed with valuable conclusions. **Major critiques** 1) This manuscript is supposed to provide the latest information concerning rehabilitation programs after stroke, which may guide a choice-making for rehabilitation after stroke so that recovery after stroke can be maximized. Actually, National Stroke Association in association with American Heart Association has provided a guideline for rehabilitation after stroke. Please see this internet address: <http://www.stroke.org/site/PageServer?pagename=rehab> From the above internet address, all information except for the detailed, technical methods of rehabilitation after stroke is provided. On



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: editorialoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

the other word, significance of this manuscript lies on information provided in Fig 1. Nevertheless, priority orders of the provided therapies, safety vs. effectiveness, and possible combination of the choices in association with detailed timeline have not been addressed. Authors may extend these topics to strengthen the manuscript other than just listed the therapies in both tables/figure 1 and in the text. 2) Authors' another point for the review seems arguing the traditional rehabilitation approaches against rehabilitation "training package". Following questions have to be addressed to strengthen the manuscript: a) Define "training package" b) List some successful training packages b) List advantages of the cited training package c) When listing the disadvantages of "recently developed rehabilitation therapy/training package" please provide citation or your own data as possible as you can to support your argument. Specific critiques 1. Please provide page number. 2. The manuscript is readable by professionals with background knowledge but many parts may be confusing due to English-expressing pattern or inappropriate grammar. It is recommended that an English edition is required. For example, let us starting with the first paragraph of "Introduction" (a) Original sentence: "The most commonly occurring deficits is to the hemiparesis, resulting in an immediate impairment to upper limb function[2-4], stand, balance and walking ability [2,3,5], which not only limit personal activities in the family and social participation but also pose a heavy physical burden on their relatives or caregiver [6]." Mistakes 1 for above sentence: the most commonly occurring deficits is Mistakes 2 for above sentence: which not only limit....pose ("which" here either describes the word before it, here "ability" or "the whole sentence" before it, either way it should be: "limits and poses"). (b) Original sentence follows the above the sentence: Although..., more than half of the patients are still frustrated on upper limb function after 6 month post stroke [2-5]. Mistake