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Reviewer's report:

I completed the review of your manuscript "Exercise prescription for patients with multiple sclerosis; Potential benefits and practical recommendations.". Despite the topic of exercise and MS is a prominent area of research and more attention is due, I think the manuscript presents several important limitations.

The main of these is that it is difficult to identify what is the real aim of your work. As a reader, I expected to receive clear, well-organized information on exercise prescription for MS patients as the result of a systematic review, but this was not.

Some general comments:

The organization of the manuscript is weak;

In part I and II there are several redundant information;

The manuscript is, in general, too long;

Some data about exercise are trivial (too divulgative, not at the level required by a scientific paper);

Criteria for literature search and papers selection have not been reported;

A table reporting synthetically the main outcomes of the cited papers is missing;

There are not discussion and conclusion;

English requires a revision.

Some specific comments, reported by line number:

53. you should be very clear about PA and exercise, your manuscript focuses on exercise not on PA;
46-83. abstract is not well organized and written;
127. change "we", it is not your opinion, it is the literature suggesting this;
132. PA/exercise, see my previous comment;
184. decide, aerobic or endurance;
188. it is not reported what EDSS is, and the acronym is not in the list of abbreviation at line 652;
209-210. you describe here what RT is, you didn't the same about endurance exercise in the previous section;
230. change "these types of exercise", it is singular;
242. check the word extremities, there is a mistake
288-289. the part about fatigue is banal;
317-318. citation is missing;
321-325. I would suggest to use exercise (as it is in the great part of the literature) instead of exercise therapy;
330-387. what it is reported in the section "Basic Concepts of Exercise Prescription" is banal and doesn't add to knowledge. Moreover, there are not citations so that it is not clear what the theoretical model Authors are looking for is. I would suggest to cancel the section;
340. what do you mean with "type of exertion"?
368. the formula 220-age to predict max HR is the most appropriate for MS patients;
389-436. the section on pre-exercise evaluation is more for a book chapter than for a paper;
459. why aquatic exercise is a "good example of an integrated exercise"? Report the reasons;
463-464. this should be in part I;
469-471 this is redundant;
474. what is the difference between arm-leg and arm ergometer?
539. repetitive;

544-545. what is the evidence for stretching practice, particularly before the training session?

550. why "ballistic stretch or bouncing with the stretch" is not recommended? What is the supporting literature?

593-595. check the sentence;

980-982, Table 1, what is the ratio of the table contents? What is the supporting literature? Report the meaning of the arrows.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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