



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_53504
Title of the Manuscript:	Immediate Effect of Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation combined with Functional Electrical Stimulation on Plantar Distribution and Body Sway Frequency in a Patient with Hemiparesis from stroke: A case report
Type of the Article	Case report

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	<p>The manuscript deals with an important issue in the area. The problem is addressed correctly. The manuscript is well-written although needs a few corrections either due to mistyping of words and/or to the inadequate use of the English language. The major problem, as I see, is the methodological approach used to answer the main question which is "The aim of the present study was to evaluate the immediate effect of a single session of anodal tDCS over the primary motor cortex combined with FES of the TA muscle on plantar distribution and body sway frequency in an individual with hemiparesis stemming from a stroke". Case studies such as the one presented may be interpreted in different ways, in part due to the unique characteristics of the participant being treated experimentally. Thus, I consider that in order to make this manuscript publishable and with information that contributes significantly to the body of knowledge, I suggest that the authors do offer explanations about the expected responses of the treatments used on patients like those of the individual treated in the study, but with slightly different characteristics.</p> <p>The fact that the authors used a randomized allocation for treatments does not prevent the threats to internal validity with respect to the effects of treatment on dependent variables. There is even a limited possibility for participants to adapt to the testing conditions or testing order may affect the results of the subsequent tests. Thus, it is important to consider the following: (1) provide information of the technical error and consistency of the dependent measures (CV, ICC etc.), in order to infer whether the differences obtained were due to treatments or just measurement error; (2) provide information of the error of the evaluations resulting from the scales in the initial evaluation of the patient. The initial assessment should have been done independently by at least two evaluators with experience in the assessment instrument; (3) there is a need need justify the characteristics of the stimuli, based on evidence from the literature; (4) discuss, based on evidence, the possible difference that may be found in patients with small variations in the patient's medical condition, so as to establish the limits of the applicability of the procedures on the screen; (5) provide inferences of small variations of the procedures and their possible answers in order to allow the proposal of this procedure to be better suited to patients with similar conditions, but with small variations in it.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The authors should prefer to use references form original studies rather than from books, unless totally necessary. I do not see the need for such references. Books, even when edited by a group of experts, is not actually assessed for it quality by independent referees. It is also advisable that the current literature be used to assure that the literature is up to date.</p> <p>English language should be reviewed for minor mistakes such misspelling and punctuation.</p>	
Optional/General comments		
Please provide the proper information (Name, University and Country). The 'Certificate' for reviewing this paper will be issued using this information.		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	<i>Paulo Sergio Chagas Gomes</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>State University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil</i>