SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_BJMMR_16002**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Effect of Rebounding Exercises Versus Whole Body Vibration on Children with Down Syndrome**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**1. In the abstract, instead of giving the final values of measured variables, provide the changes in each one including their standard units (optionally, changes as per cent values might also be provided).** **2. Specify the manufacturer and model of the DXA scanner and the software version used.** **3. Use metric units (SI) for the dimensions of the trampoline (page 5, lines 189-192).** **4. In Tables 2 to 4, provide the exact P-values.** **5. In Table 4, the BMD values (mean and SD) should be provided with three digits at the right of the point, as this is the conventional way of expressing them.** **6. Delete figures 2 to 4 as they duplicate information already contained in the tables.** **7. Please state concisely the limitations of the study in the Discussion section.**	1. We have added these in the abstract 2.we have added in the paper 3. we have changed into meter in the paper 4. we put the exact p-value in the tables 5. we changed the values in the tables 6. I have deleted them 7. we have added the limitations
Minor REVISION comments	1. P-value, kg, cm and g/cm^2 are standard symbols. There is no need to explain them in the table footnotes. 2. Also, there is no need to notice in all tables that values are mean ± SD, since this was stated in the Methods section. 3. For some reason, "tibia" is spelled "tabia" four times in Table 4. 4. "Meter" should be abbreviated "m" (Table 2 heading). 5. I was unable to find reference 63 online.	1. I have deleted them 2. I have deleted them 3. Sorry, we have corrected them 4. We put the abbreviation 5. I corrected it in the references

	6. A revision of the manuscript by an English-speaking expert will improve its readability.	6. English-speaking expert revised the paper making corrections
Optional/General comments	I would recommend shortening the discussion section (which looks as a review) and focusing it in the original findings, its relevance and relationship with previous studies.	We tried to shorten the discussion Thanks a lot sir for your valuable advices and comments. We hope that we clarified everything for you.