

	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	Yes. This manuscript is extremely important as many therapists do not realize that they can use FES in early stroke rehab. This study demonstrates that FES in early stroke rehab is a highly effective treatment when combined with other therapies.	
Is the title of the article suitable? Do you have any alternative Title in your mind?	Yes. Alternate title: OUTCOMES OF FUNCTIONAL ELECTRICAL STIMULATION ON UPPER EXTREMITY MOBILITY AND FUNCTION DURING STROKE REHABILITATION- A PILOT STUDY	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	Yes.	
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.	All sections are appropriate.	
Do you think that the references in the manuscript are proper, recent and sufficient? If you have any suggestions, please write here.	Yes.	

PART 1: Article Title: FEASIBILITY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF MULTICHANNEL FUNCTIONAL ELECTRICAL STIMULATION ON

UPPER EXTREMITY MOBILITY AND FUNCTION DURING STROKE REHABILITATION- A PILOT STUDY

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> No.	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	No.	
Do you think the article is plagiarized? If yes, please justify your answer and send us some proof.	No.	
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.

PART 4: Objective Evaluation:

Guideline	MARKS of this manuscript
-----------	--------------------------

<p>Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this manuscript (Highest: 10 Lowest: 0)</p> <p>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)</p>	<p>I would give this manuscript a 9/10. It is an exceptional study that should be accepted as is or with only minor revisions.</p>
---	---