

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80994
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF MULLIGAN MOBILIZATION ON PROPRIOCEPTION IN OSTEOARTHRITIS OF KNEE JOINT - A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW
Type of the Article	Systematic Review

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:

<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

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>While the topic of this study seems interesting, there are some areas of concern that should be fixed.</p> <p>This study does not provide enough details on significant components of a systematic review, namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The data search strategy needs a substantial revision as it is unclear why the authors ignored all research prior to 2000? Why did they include only RCTs and case studies? Why did they exclude Cochrane Library? what mesh terms or subject heading do they use? ...etc. The data screening lacks information on why from 120 articles, they only included four studies? What specific reasons? Is their approach valid? 2. Quality assessment should be explained in more details. Pedro scale is meant to assess RCTs; however, the authors also included a case study without any reference to this in the quality assessment section. 3. The Results section is missing from the manuscript. Only tables without sufficient introductory texts make the manuscript look weird. The authors should present their findings qualitatively (and quantitatively if possible) with reference to the tables and/or figures. 4. The discussion, at times, looks muddy. There is no deep interpretation of their findings in the discussion section. In this way, it is hard to follow the flow of the arguments, and the conclusions do not seem to be based on this study. In other words, I do not see the real contribution that distinguishes this systematic review from other similar reviews. 5. The limitation section should be expanded to include all the possible sources of bias, the generalizability issues, why met-analysis is not feasible, their recommendations for future research, and clear justifications of each. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>There are numerous language errors (grammatical, typos, sentence structure ...etc.) that should be fixed.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I also suggest taking care of the language. There are some areas where a grammar check is needed. Probably, consulting a proofreading professional is a good idea. 	

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> None	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alhadi M. Jahan
Department, University & Country	University Of Ottawa, Canada