

BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243 E-mail: bpgoffice@wignet.com http://www.wignet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 24440

Title: Slacklining and stroke: A rehabilitation case study considering balance and lower

limb weakness

Reviewer's code: 03397014

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-01-24 18:50

Date reviewed: 2016-03-01 17:41

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[] Accept
[] Grade B: Very good	[] Grade B: Minor language	[] The same title	[] High priority for
[Y] Grade C: Good	polishing	[] Duplicate publication	publication
[] Grade D: Fair	[] Grade C: A great deal of	[] Plagiarism	[] Rejection
[] Grade E: Poor	language polishing	[Y] No	[Y] Minor revision
	[] Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	[] Major revision
		[] The same title	
		[] Duplicate publication	
		[] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper proposes the activity 'Slacklining' as a rehabilitation supplement following stroke in the form of a case report and theoretical explanation. The manuscript is well written, and supported by references appropriately. Whilst a case report is unable to provide any real reassurances or evidence for a proposed intervention, this article is succinct, and acknowledges the need for further research. A few questions and minor points for the authors. How did the opportunity to 'slackline' (assuming that is the correct verb) come about to the patient? Whilst there are no indications of foul-play, a skeptic might consider the possibility that the author has recognised the opportunity to test the feasibility of a relatively rare activity in various healthcare scenarios where a range of physical activities may indeed provide benefit. If slacklining was not available, what would the attending physician's (and the physical therapists) approach have been for this patient? Are there examples of other such patients? There is some minor repetition in methods and results (e.g. supports / stick etc.) sections that could be amended.



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243 E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 24440

Title: Slacklining and stroke: A rehabilitation case study considering balance and lower

limb weakness

Reviewer's code: 00503828 Reviewer's country: Japan Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-01-24 18:50

Date reviewed: 2016-03-05 16:29

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[Y] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[] Grade B: Very good	[] Grade B: Minor language	[] The same title	[] High priority for
[] Grade C: Good	polishing	[] Duplicate publication	publication
[] Grade D: Fair	[] Grade C: A great deal of	[] Plagiarism	[] Rejection
[] Grade E: Poor	language polishing	[Y] No	[] Minor revision
	[] Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	[] Major revision
		[] The same title	
		[] Duplicate publication	
		[] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article is interesitg and educational, as it is.



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

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 24440

Title: Slacklining and stroke: A rehabilitation case study considering balance and lower

limb weakness

Reviewer's code: 01220036

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-01-24 18:50

Date reviewed: 2016-01-24 21:44

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[] Grade B: Very good	[] Grade B: Minor language	[] The same title	[] High priority for
[Y] Grade C: Good	polishing	[] Duplicate publication	publication
[] Grade D: Fair	[] Grade C: A great deal of	[] Plagiarism	[] Rejection
[] Grade E: Poor	language polishing	[Y] No	[] Minor revision
	[] Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	[] Major revision
		[] The same title	
		[] Duplicate publication	
		[] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Accept as is