



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMMR_20549
Title of the Manuscript:	Spine Condition Improvement. Health Training Plan for Persons with a Movement Deficit
Type of the Article	Policy 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>These are my recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Complete grammar revision. In many instances the author, ideas does not come across effectively. After reading the paper a few times, the gist of the paper emerges. 2. Planning of sub categories or sections needs to be revised to allow a flowing paper that enhances the content. Tables need to be revised. 3. The methodology needs to identify the specific search engines used. 4. The discussion was strong. Well done. <p>The paper as whole needs attention to detail.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I made the revision of the text and corrected the errors (below list of fixes). I am aware, however, that I am not able to make professional grammar check, because English is not our first language. Therefore, I would like to ask if a professional editor could help me in finalization of the manuscript to the publishing? 2. A note about "readability" - the essence of the work - may be associated with the need to adapt the structure of the work to "instructions for authors". Design works have a different structure than typical medical work. Most attention is paid to introducing the reader to the essence of the design, namely the objectives which should achieved in future after a specific type of activity. However, in this way arise disproportion between the volume of "introduction", "aims of work", "method and material", "results" and "conclusions". Here, in addition to the work objectives (paper) I presented training targets (which it should be expected in future after HT). This can be a difficult understanding of the nature, particularly at the beginning. But then the later part of the text reading, should lead the reader to fully understand. In this case helps the graphical structure, which is typical of projects works. (Tables 3a and 3b). I hope that tables appropriately complements the content.



SDI Review Form 1.6

		<p>3. I improved readability tables 1 and 2</p> <p>4. We are pleased that our work has been recognized in the eyes of the reviewer. We would like to thank you for your positive comments and suggestions for changes. All comments are very important to us, because, every feedback improves the quality of our work on planning and implementation.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		