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 Methodology
ESPS manuscript NO: 17315
Title: Has the clinical neurological examination been overtaken by electrophysiological studies? Reflections from experiences in occupational medicine?
Reviewer's code: 02141010
Reviewer's country: United States
Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji
Date sent for review: 2015-03-02 16:54
Date reviewed: 2015-04-08 23:59

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 polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an appropriate article pointing out the benefit of a new detailed neurological examination over referral to a neurology/electorphysiological test.

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 Methodology
ESPS manuscript NO: 17315
Title: Has the clinical neurological examination been overtaken by electrophysiological studies? Reflections from experiences in occupational medicine?
Reviewer's code: 00060492
Reviewer's country: United States
Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji
Date sent for review: 2015-03-02 16:54
Date reviewed: 2015-04-20 22:47

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting opinion paper. It is clear that the author has worked on these techniques for many years. Minor comments: 1. The end of the title does not require a question mark. 2. Given the issues with specificity (noted below), consider substituting the word "basic" for "superficial" physical examination. Major comments: 1. It would be useful to provide an algorithm of the techniques you employ in order to demonstrate that this is a systematic diagnostic approach that pinpoints a diagnosis. 2. There are reasons to avoid blind faith in technology (see Crit Care Med. 2010 Feb;38(2):712-3.). However, even the author has noted that these techniques are sensitive, but not specific (BMC Neurol. 2014; 14: 90). 3. Despite the use and improvement of these diagnostic techniques, you still comment that "this validated physical approach may eventually constitute a step towards improved prevention and treatment of work-related upper limb disorders". Is there any evidence that use of these diagnostic techniques improves outcomes? If so, provide that evidence.