



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_48264
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of trans-mastoidal vestibular galvanic stimulation in improvement gait performance and upright postural stability in hemiplegic C.P. children
Type of the Article	Original research papers

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>I believe this is an interesting article that has a lot of potential. Methodologically, it appears that the study was conducted well and follows standard scientific procedure and statistical analysis.</p> <p>Most of my problem in reading this article is that the formatting (full justification) and awkward wording (i.e., plasticity way) makes it very difficult to read this article. Thus, it was hard for me to judge the merits of the article. The article can benefit from a more thorough editing. Although, I did enjoy the figures.</p> <p>Also, I think all of the tables could be combined into 1 easily enough to save on space and avoid redundancy.</p>	<p>Thank you so much about your interesting comments</p> <p>But the plagiarism is the problem .the article should be original but i will try to improve it.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Abstracts – “Control Groups” – It appears that that there is only 1</p> <p>What is BOS?</p> <p>“Extremely representatives improvemnts” – What does this mean”</p> <p>“worthless representatives” – What does this mean?</p> <p>Often times words are put in parentheses thus removing them grammatically from the sentence structure when they should be there grammatically.</p>	<p>-because the the all results of control group in different variables is the same</p> <p>-</p> <p>-Base of support</p> <p>-mean highly significant improvment (avoid plagiarism)</p> <p>-mean insignificant improvment</p> <p>-i will do</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>Authors may want to consider having manuscript by someone in English department there</p> <p>Are many grammatical errors throughout manuscript.</p>	<p>- I will check manuscript grammatically</p>

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	No ethical problems ocured