

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	Achievements and Challenges of Medicine and Medical Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3602
Title of the Manuscript:	Ten Years Post Bilateral TKR with LBA – Physiotherapy Can Help?
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The content provided is not written properly, as it contains numerous grammatical errors and spelling mistakes. Please rewrite the content with accurate grammar and correct spelling.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Physiotherapy Interventions for Long-Term Management of LBA Ten Years After Bilateral TKR	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract can be added with functional or ADL difficulties with ICF	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate for a research article but could benefit from some reorganization and refinement to enhance readability and flow. Below are specific observations and recommendations:</p> <p>Observations: Introduction:</p> <p>The introduction provides background and rationale but is overly dense and contains fragmented ideas. It could be streamlined for clarity. Aims and Objectives:</p> <p>Clearly stated but should be consolidated into the introduction or as a distinct subsection under "Introduction." Materials and Methodology:</p> <p>This section is well-structured, but the background information could be made more concise to focus on methods. Clinical Prognosis and Results:</p> <p>Results are presented with appropriate metrics, but this section would benefit from clearer subsectioning to separate "Treatment" and "Outcomes." Discussion:</p> <p>Thoroughly addresses the research questions but lacks a structured approach to summarize findings, implications, and limitations.</p>	

[Review Form2](#)

	<p>Conclusion:</p> <p>The conclusion effectively summarizes findings but should explicitly highlight the study's contributions and recommendations for future research.</p> <p>References:</p> <p>References are relevant but require recent additions for a more contemporary perspective.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Introduction:</p> <p>Include a distinct subsection titled "Aims and Objectives" at the end of the introduction to provide a clear transition to the methodology.</p> <p>Materials and Methodology:</p> <p>Split into subsections such as "Background Information," "Interventions," and "Outcome Measures" for better readability.</p> <p>Results:</p> <p>Create subsections within results (e.g., "Quantitative Results" and "Qualitative Observations") to clearly separate findings.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>Add subsections for "Key Findings," "Clinical Implications," and "Limitations" to make the discussion more structured.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>Provide a separate paragraph summarizing contributions and practical applications, along with recommendations for future studies.</p> <p>By adopting these changes, the manuscript will have a clearer structure that aligns with scholarly standards, improving its impact and comprehension.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness and robustness by addressing a clinically relevant issue of chronic low back ache (LBA) in post-bilateral total knee replacement (TKR) patients, an under-researched area. It provides a thorough analysis of the patient's condition, including specific interventions such as lumbar stabilization exercises and yoga, supported by evidence-based practice. The study effectively links pre-operative factors such as obesity, lumbar spine disorders, and osteoporosis with post-operative outcomes, emphasizing the importance of comprehensive rehabilitation. Furthermore, the results are presented with quantitative metrics like Oswestry Disability Index, cadence, and waist circumference, ensuring technical soundness and clarity in outcome evaluation.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>:-</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript are foundational and relevant to the topic; however, many of them are dated, with some being over a decade old. While they provide valuable context, integrating more recent studies would strengthen the manuscript and provide updated insights into the management of chronic low back ache (LBA) in post-TKR patients.</p>	

[Review Form2](#)

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article requires improvement to meet the standards of scholarly communication. While the content is relevant and meaningful, the manuscript contains several grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, and inconsistent sentence structures that may hinder comprehension.</p> <p>Suggestions for Revision: Grammatical Improvements:</p> <p>Correct verb tenses to maintain consistency (e.g., "subjects were pre-operatively treated" instead of "subjects should pre operatively be treated"). Replace incorrect phrasing (e.g., "her level of prognosis were as below" to "her prognosis levels are outlined below"). Clarity and Precision:</p> <p>Simplify overly complex sentences for better readability. Use precise terms (e.g., "low back ache" should consistently appear as "low back pain"). Scholarly Tone:</p> <p>Replace informal expressions with more professional language (e.g., "with being obese, weight reduction means can influence" to "obesity management may influence outcomes"). By addressing these issues, the manuscript's readability and overall quality will be greatly improved, making it more suitable for scholarly dissemination.</p>	
<p>Optional/Generalcomments</p>	<p>Justification:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>The manuscript addresses an under-researched yet clinically relevant issue of chronic low back pain in post-bilateral TKR patients.</p> <p>The study design and interventions are appropriate and supported by evidence.</p> <p>Quantitative results are presented clearly with relevant metrics.</p> <p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <p>The language quality requires significant refinement to meet scholarly standards.</p> <p>Recent and relevant references are lacking, and some listed references are not cited in the text.</p> <p>The manuscript structure could benefit from reorganization for clarity and coherence.</p> <p>With revisions and additions, the manuscript has the potential to score higher and contribute meaningfully to the field.</p>	

[Review Form2](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pavana
Department, University & Country	RGUHS, India