

Article Title: *Adaptive Wakeboarding: A Case Report on Equipment Modifications and Strength Training for Improved Performance*

PART 1:

Review 2	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 contributes meaningfully to the adaptive sports and rehabilitation literature by addressing a clear gap concerning equipment modifications for individuals with neurological conditions, specifically cerebral palsy. It bridges assistive technology, biomechanics, and therapeutic exercise in an applied, case-based framework. The paper has value for clinicians, researchers, and adaptive sport program designers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? Do you have any alternative Title in your mind?	Yes, the title is suitable and informative. It clearly conveys the topic, research design, and purpose. Alternative suggestion (optional): "Enhancing Adaptive Wakeboarding Performance through Equipment Modification and Strength Training: A Case Report."	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	Yes. The abstract is well-written and effectively summarizes the background, purpose, intervention, and outcomes. Minor suggestion: Include a brief statement on the study design (single case) and specific performance outcomes (e.g., percentage improvement in endurance) to better reflect the strength of the evidence.	
Do you think the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	Yes. The manuscript is professionally written and readable, with appropriate technical language and academic tone. Minor edits suggested: occasional phrasing could be tightened for conciseness (e.g., reduce repetition of "improved performance" or "enhanced participation"). A light copyedit for flow would further improve clarity	

<p>Please provide your comments regarding the appropriateness of different sections of the manuscript.</p>	<p>Introduction/Literature Review: Excellent synthesis of adaptive sport literature, barriers to participation, and the rationale for focusing on neurological conditions. Provides strong justification for the study’s relevance.</p> <p>Case Presentation/Methods: Detailed and transparent. The inclusion of the BTE Primus RS data strengthens methodological rigor. Ethical approval and participant consent were addressed appropriately.</p> <p>Intervention Description: Well-documented, highlighting user-centered design and interdisciplinary collaboration. The integration of biomechanical training and assistive technology is commendable.</p> <p>Results: Data are presented clearly with tables that effectively show pre- and post-intervention progress. Statistical analysis (t-test, effect size) is appropriate for a single-subject design.</p> <p>Discussion: Insightful interpretation of clinical and psychosocial outcomes. The authors successfully connect findings to systemic and practical challenges in adaptive sports.</p> <p>Conclusion: Strong and reflective, though a brief section on future research directions (e.g., replication in a small cohort) would enhance completeness.</p> <p>Figures/Tables: Clear and relevant. Including image captions describing relevance (beyond “Participant positioned...”) would improve reader engagement.</p>	
<p>Do you think that the references in the manuscript are proper, recent and sufficient? If you have any suggestions, please write here.</p>	<p>Yes. The reference list is comprehensive, current, and appropriately cited (many from 2019–2024). Citations are drawn from reputable journals in adaptive physical activity and rehabilitation.</p> <p>Minor recommendation: Include a few additional references connecting adaptive wakeboarding to broader assistive technology frameworks or N=1 design methodologies if available.</p>	

PART 2:

	Editor's comment	
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	None identified. IRB approval and participant consent were obtained.	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	N/A	
Do you think the article is plagiarized? If yes, please justify your answer and send us some proof.	No evidence of plagiarism detected. Original work with appropriate citations.	
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)	Not necessary. The case report does not appear to duplicate previously published material.	

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. CML

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>9/10</p> <p>This is a high-quality and innovative case report addressing an underrepresented topic in adaptive sports medicine. Minor refinements:</p> <p>Additional contextual detail in figures and expanded discussion on generalizability.</p> <p>Some parts of the manuscript could be made clearer and easier to read by removing repetitive phrases and simplifying sentence structure. For example, terms such as “<i>improved performance</i>,” “<i>enhanced participation</i>,” and “<i>increased endurance</i>” are used multiple times throughout the paper—these could be combined or varied to avoid redundancy.</p> <p>In a few sections (especially the Introduction and Discussion), sentences are long and contain several ideas at once. Breaking them into shorter sentences would improve readability and help the reader follow the main points more easily. For instance, when describing the barriers to adaptive sport participation or the participant’s progress, focus on one key idea per sentence.</p> <p>Transitions between sections can also be smoothed out. Adding short linking phrases such as “As a result,” “In contrast,” or “This finding suggests” can help the flow of information feel more natural.</p> <p>Overall, a careful edit aimed at removing extra words, shortening long sentences, and improving transitions will make the paper more concise, direct, and engaging for readers.</p> <p>This would strengthen the manuscript for publication.</p>