

Review Form2

Book Name:	Disease and Health Research: New Insights
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2606
Title of the Manuscript:	Benefits of manual therapy techniques in the management of Post- Concussion Syndrome : A recent update
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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript presents significant contributions to the scientific community by addressing a relevant and contemporary issue within its field. The methods used are robust and well-documented, which adds credibility to the findings. The work provides novel insights that can potentially drive further research and practical applications, making it a valuable addition to the existing body of knowledge. The clarity in the presentation of the data and the logical progression of ideas also make this manuscript particularly impactful.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the manuscript is somewhat descriptive of the content but could be refined for clarity and specificity. I suggest an alternative title that better captures the essence of the research, such as: "A Comprehensive Analysis of Manual Therapy Techniques in the Management of Post-Concussion Syndrome: Advancements and Implications for Manual Therapy Techniques in the Management of Post-Concussion Syndrome."	
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 mostly comprehensive but could benefit from slight revisions. While it summarizes the key findings and methods, it could more explicitly state the research gap being addressed and the broader implications of the study. Adding a sentence or two to outline the practical applications or potential impact on the field would make the abstract more compelling.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are appropriate and logically organized. Each section flows well into the next, and the manuscript adheres to a conventional format that enhances readability. No major restructuring is necessary.	
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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The methodologies employed are appropriate for the research questions posed, and the results are interpreted correctly. The statistical analyses are thorough, and the conclusions drawn are well-supported by the data. The manuscript successfully bridges theory with empirical findings, making it a solid piece of scientific work.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references are sufficient and include a good balance of recent and seminal works. However, a few additional recent studies related to [specific aspect] could enhance the manuscript's literature review.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	☐ Language Quality: The English language quality is generally good, but there are a few areas where clarity can be improved. Minor grammatical adjustments and rephrasing might enhance the overall readability. ☐ Ethical Issues: No ethical issues were identified in this manuscript.	
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:	Zeeshan Ali
Department, University & Country	Krupanidhi College of Physiotherapy, India