

Review Form2

Book Name:	Disease and Health Research: New Insights
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2486
Title of the Manuscript:	Harnessing the Power of Artificial Intelligence in Neuromuscular Disease Rehabilitation: A Comprehensive Review and Algorithmic Approach
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is critical for the scientific community as it explores how AI technology is revolutionizing rehabilitation for neuromuscular diseases. By detailing AI-driven interventions like robotic-assisted therapy and machine learning, it advances our understanding of personalized treatment. The research paves the way for future innovations, enhancing patient outcomes and quality of life.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is informative but could be made more concise and impactful. A revised title could be: "Revolutionizing Neuromuscular Disease Rehabilitation: A Comprehensive Review of AI-Driven Interventions and Algorithms"	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive, covering the key aspects of AI's role in neuromuscular disease rehabilitation. However, a few suggestions could enhance clarity and focus: Mention the specific neuromuscular diseases covered or if the review is general, to give readers a clearer idea of the scope. Emphasize Impact	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
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 minimumof3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Because its methodology, including well-defined objectives and appropriate data procedures. The statistical analysis is meticulously conducted, ensuring that the findings are both reliable and valid. The clarity of the presentation enhances its credibility, making the manuscript a valuable contribution to the field.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	Yes , references are sufficient	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ravi Kumar
Department, University & Country	M. J. P. Rohilkhand University, India