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	The rationale for the study is not clear enough. Also, effective rebounding exercising implies appropriate motor control/balance, which may not be the case in the studied population.	We clarified it in the paper now We selected the children who were able to practice rebounding exercises according to our primary evaluation and the selection criteria of the children. We excluded the children who couldn't able to perform it
	The conclusions are limited by the fact that there is neither a control group nor a "positive control" group. At this point, it is impossible to determine if the results are due to the addition of either WBV or rebounding or the "designed exercise program alone"	There was no significant differences pre treatment between both groups. Both groups received the same selected exercise program. After that the differences in the results may be due to WBV or rebounding. I have added the exercise program in details in the paper. And there are studies done on the effect of WBV and rebounding exercises and we compare between both
	Are there any reliability data for the assessments?	6 minute walk test is reliable method for children. There is paper confirmed that I have added it in the paper. While x-ray and BMD are known as reliable methods of assessment
	BMD data should be revisited by using bone mineral apparent density (BMAD; g/cm3) approach. BMAD is assessed by dividing the BMD in a given site (i.e. the spine, total femur, or whole body) by the square root of the corresponding body area (BA) (BMAD=BMD/√BA). It is important to highlight that the BMAD is a measurement of volumetric density, aiming to minimize the effect of growth on longitudinal analysis in children (Carter et al., 1992 and Crabtee et al., 2007). This is important specially due to the improvements found in	SIR, we depend recent studies done using BMD in children such as, **Eid MA, Ibrahim MM and Aly SA. Effect of resistance and aerobic exercises on bone mineral density, muscle strength and functional ability in children**

	BMD. 3 months is a relatively short period for significant changes in BMD and in order to strengthen these findings, any influence of growth in the results should be ruled out.	**with hemophilia. Egypt J Med Hum Genetics 2014; 15, 139–147** We have stated in our exclusion criteria that exclude any children who had any factors affecting BMD The study was conducted for three months which is a period did not lead to a significant change in the growth and during the study we had followed the children growth throughout the study but we didn't stated that in the paper before. Now we added table regarding to that in the results. the age of the children is small not reach to the puberty stage that leads big changes in the growth. We have stated the results as obtained from the study
	It is important to thoroughly inform the reader in regard of the details of the "designed exercise program" that was administered similarly to both groups.	We added the program in details in the paper
	Statistical approach is inadequate. You have a 2 x 2 design (group x time). The least you should use is a two-way anova, ideally, a mixed-model for repeated measures. As it is, the results cannot be fully appreciated at this time.	Sir our study was conducted on two groups and we applied two different methods of treatment and measure the changes in three groups pre and after 3 months. so, we had one factor only Which is the group so the most suitable statistical method is t-test to compare within and between the groups? This statistic was performed by statistic expert

	Discussion of the results could benefit from the inclusion of: - Study limitations - Contrast on the mechanisms of action between training strategies (i.e. neural adaptations due to WBV exercising vs. rebounding exercise). This may be particularly helpful when discussing differences in genu recurvatum angle between training modes. - Lack of sensitivity/specificity of the tests chosen (i.e. 6MWT)	We have added that in the discussion
	There is no scientific basis for some of the assumptions made by the authors. A good example is the following sentence *"A rebounder also takes a lot more effort and time. Simply standing on a WBV platform, the machine does all the work while the body gets all the benefits. 100% of all the muscles in the body are activated and exercised at the same time, as well as all the systems in the body being stimulated, even including the brain and eyes"*	Because our study is the first one to compare between rebounding exercises and WBV so we tried to search to anything supported our findings and we found that online so we added it as support. But we appreciate your opinion sir and trying to search again without finding new so our study considered the first comparative one

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Please divide your text into paragraphs as the current format is hard to read. First appearance of "genu recurvatum" is misspelled. This sentence is unappropriated, scientifically speaking *"Rebounding is an exercise that exercises every cell in the body at once by helping the body to increase its resistive load via trampoline rebounding."*	We divided the text We have corrected it We have changed that
Optional/General comments		Thanks a lot sir for your valuable advices and comments. We hope that we clarified everything for you.