

PART 1: Article Title:

	Editor's comment	Author's comment <i>(If agreed with the editor, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors must write his/her feedback here)</i>
Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? Please write a few sentences explaining your answer	This study looked at novel information affecting hip strength due to detrimental posture. Populations spend more time in a sitting posture these days and it is important to know that hip strength will be affected with poor posture.	
Is the title of the article suitable? Do you have any alternative Title in your mind?	Yes, the article is suitable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	Yes, article abstract is sufficient.	
Do you think the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	Yes!	
Please provide your comments regarding the appropriateness of different sections of the manuscript.	I think the HHMTD device could use a little more explanation as to how it works (line 95). The more commonly known handheld dynamometer (HHD) is held in the subject's hand to measure hand strength. I was very confused as to how you were measuring hip abductor strength until I looked up the HHMTD device! It looks like a neat device but may be more common in physical therapy fields.	
Do you think that the references in the manuscript are proper, recent and sufficient? If you have any suggestions, please write here.	They are appropriate and timely.	

PART 2:

	Editor's comment	
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail)</i>	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	Not that I see.	
Do you think the article is plagiarized? If yes, please justify your answer and send us some proof.	Not that I can tell.	
Do you think a Disclaimer is required to explain the history of this manuscript? (As in most cases chapters of reference books are extended versions of previously published articles in some journals)	no	

PART 3: Declaration of Competing Interest of the Editor:

Here reviewer should declare his/her competing interest. If nothing to declare he/she can write "I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer"

I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer. Correct.

PART 4: Objective Evaluation:

Guideline	MARKS of this manuscript
Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this manuscript (Highest: 10 Lowest: 0)	8
Guideline:	

Accept As It Is: (>9-10) Minor Revision: (>8-9) Major Revision: (>7-8) Serious Major revision: (>5-7) Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered): (>3-5) Strongly rejected (with irreparable deficiencies.): (>0-3)	
---	--