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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions

1. A flow diagram that shows the pool of patients admitted to the rehabilitation unit across the recruitment period and shows the dilution down to the volunteers and what percentage of the ‘suitable’ patients volunteered to participate needs to be included into the paper. Then what percentage of the volunteers who chose to undertake Wii Fit therapy over conventional therapy would be evident. This addition would clarify this aspect of the methods as the number of participants in the questionnaire was only divulged in table 3. Defining the contents of table 3 in the results section alluded to “the mode of therapy offered (WiiFit or conventional) did not significantly influence the respondent’s choice’ the reader could not ‘see’ how this statement reflected in the volunteers except through the statistical result. If a flow diagram showing the steps to the final group of participants were provided this problem would be solved and enable readers to accept the results provided.

2. Some discussion about the number of intervention sessions and whether about 6 were sufficient for the participants to make their post-discharge decisions would enhance the discussion of the findings.

3. The conclusion in the abstract that ‘Wii Fit as a therapy tool is limited not only by the small proportion of people who are functionally able to use it’ needs to be introduced into the discussion. Not necessarily as a limitation of this study but as a limitation of the utility of WiiFit as a therapy tool. This would be easier to introduce to the discussion if a flow diagram of the dilution of the pool of patients were provided. As it is there is really nothing in the body of the paper to support this statement in the abstract.

4. Some discussion of future research needs to be added into the discussion. You might have pursued the statement that participants ‘perceived that conventional therapy was more effective’ as a topic for future research.

5. In both the abstract and conclusion sections the statement ‘WiiFit as part of a therapy program’ was made. The methods section mentioned the application of the WiiFit intervention but there was no statement as to whether this comprised all therapy or was an adjunct to conventional physiotherapy. This aspect needs to be clarified or the ‘part of a therapy program’ needs to be deleted if the intervention comprised the ‘whole’ intervention and not ‘part of’ the intervention.

Minor essential revisions
1. In the abstract you need to add (DCE) after discrete choice experiment in line 1 of methods.

2. Reference 16 in the reference list has a spelling mistake for correction ‘woment’s’

3. The inclusion of the FIM scores in the results to demonstrate functional level after no mention in the methods that this measure was being considered either indicates that you should replace the inclusion criterion of being ‘able to perform sit-to-stand transfers without physical assistance, ambulating independently prior to admission’ with a statement that includes mention of the FIM or delete this part of the sentence in results and state that participants functional mobility was above inclusion requirements.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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