



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJAST_17876
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of Tupler Technique on Reducing Post Natal Diastasis Recti
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Introduction Clear but long. Please consider only 3-4 paragraphs which concentrate on 1- Pathology and how much it is common after delivery 2- Treatment options. It written very well in lines 50-51. Then summarize the technique you chosen and its advantages. Any detail regarding the technique should be mentioned in the section of materials and methods. Then the last paragraph you should mention the aim of the work. It is important to document that studies which demonstrated use of Tuplar technique are few. Lines 93-94: you wrote absolute contraindication are.. I think this is not the correct place. Please consider shifting it to section of methodology; you can say: patients with heavy bleeding..... were excluded from the study according to (mention your reference if you like). Communication with the obstetrician or primary health care physicians is very important. If you mentioned it in the methodology it will support your work. Communication is the key of practice of medicine in the future. -line 63 you wrote Tuplar technique is the only research supported... what is the meaning by research supported. I feel that it could be better to be replaced by (evidence - based). Section materials and methods Subjects	The correction was done



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 104; Kasr Al Aini University Hospital, put the first letters in capital (red letters) Same line (104); you wrote they were randomly selected from.... Please consult a statistician to write appropriately what happened. You randomly selected patients with diastasis from normal population or from patients with diastasis. The usual way is considering all patients with diastasis then you will randomise them to groups where one group will receive specific treatment while the other receives another treatment or will serve as control group. Line 232: statistical analysis Did you use any computer program? Please mention it if it was used. Lastly where the ethical issues. You should mention that the study was approved from ethical committee (or comparable committee) in your institution. Results and discussion Please put each section separately (results & discussion) Results It written in very unusual way as you represent in a conference or meeting. Please start you results by.... the study included 60 patients because it is expected that some patients cannot follow till the end of study. Then please make results understandable and go directly for your findings as in abstract. Also start with main outcome which is decrease in diastasis	The correction was done We select patients with diastasis recti then we randomize them to groups and I correct this in manuscript. Patient number was mentioned in subject material and method.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	instead of putting it as table 6. The way of commenting on the table is unusual and it is similar to presentation of a thesis. Up to my knowledge no such comments are written in between tables. Then what is meaning by between groups and within subjects. I prefer to be written in the usual way. Discussion is very poor. You are discussing your results not discussing the importance of the subject. The first paragraph (line 305- 312) should be summarized and transferred to introduction. The same for the second paragraph, it is a summary of materials and methods. It could be written in discussion if used a new method so you try to convince the reader. Therefore it unnecessary. Then the poor way of discussion, agree , disagree, support .. Please say something about your results. You can start discussion directly .. this is first published study about use of Tuplar technique for treatment of postnatal diastasis recti in Egypt. Diameter of diastasis as well as hip waist ration were significantly reduced after 18 months of treatment (this is only a suggestion), Then you can say... previous reports (studies..) showed similar results (put references). You can say something to make your study different .. you can say in our population.. the results regarding something is highly significant. Say anything which will make your study interesting for the reader instead of useless repetitions. Then you introduce your recommendations like ... ladies seen in the postnatal period are encouraged to use this method not only because it is cosmetic but also it may prevent further deterioration in next pregnancies.	The correction was done
--	---	--------------------------------



SDI Review Form 1.6

	References Reference 15 put page range of chapter Consider updating of the references for example: Pascoal AG, Dionisio S, Cordeiro F, Mota P. Inter- rectus distance in postpartum women can be reduced by isometric contraction of the abdominal muscles: a preliminary case- control study. <u>Physiotherapy</u> . 2014;100(4):344-8.	The correction was done
Minor REVISION comments	The title could be; Efficacy of Tupler technique on reducing post natal diastasis: a controlled study	The correction was done
Optional/General comments		