## SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

**PART 1:**

| | |
|---|---|
| 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** |

**PART 2:**

| **FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)** | **Authors' response to final evaluator's comments** |
|---|---|
| Title, **Efficacy of Tupler Technique on Reducing Post Natal Diastasis Recti: a controlled study**<br>**Please put colon after recti. Efficacy on or in? I'm not sure.**<br>**Introduction still long.**<br>**Material and methods,**<br>**II- instruments**<br>**Evaluating instruments**<br>**Please say something that all patients were subjected to**<br>**Section results:**<br>**Please confirm that all patients continued therapy because it could be expected that some patients will be lost from. It could be possible that some patient discontinue therapy, transferred to another city or another hospital.**<br>**Lines 246-249, go directly to the main results… there were significant differences between two groups after treatment. Remove in the. No need to mention that there was no difference between the two groups before treatment. This is oversimplification. The most important is to remove the word but because the reader may think that there is a mistake. But, means that we are so sorry because we found significant difference…we are so sorry because we found this this method is effective!**<br>**Line 245 table 2 demonstrated, please correct to demonstrates**<br>**For table 2 line, again please remove but. Why you are insisting to consider your good results as abnormal or unexpected.**<br>**Remove but for table 3 as before,**<br>**Table 3 make a space between group and B**<br>**Discussion**<br>May I suggest<br>This study showes that Tuplar technique is highly effective method for treatment of postnatal diastasis recti. Diameter of diastasis as well as hip waist ratio were significantly reduced after 18 months of treatment in 30 patients. This reduction was significantly more than in similar patients who had Tuplar splint only without Tuplar exercise (or similar words).<br>Then say something why this method is effective…. For example this can be explained by .. Tuplar exercise increase blood supply of the muscle. Say something about duration of therapy for example… although the duration of therapy is long, it avoids complications of surgery like infection, scar and possible recurrence. Furthermore this long period allows regeneration of fibrous tissue and nerve fibres. You can put the your paragraph of Hickey et al 2011. Explanation and continuous support of the patients are essential.<br>Then continue your discussion. However still the same repetition of the same issue. Line 282, you wrote The results of the study were supported by Pascoal et al., (2014). What do you mean: results of your study in 2015 were supported in the last year by Pascoal et al. Who support whom? You will support him against another if there was **controversy about the value of the technique**. Please, please get rid of these terms (support, | |

| | |
|---|---|
| agree, disagree,…)<br>Please say something which will make the reader understand the article for example.. similar results were reported by … et al. In their study which included … patients or you summarized all authors in one paragraph. Go into the depth of other studies, if you like mention number of patients, mention something about the degree of diastasis or any other. Do feel that their studies are similar to your study in everything including the number of the patients. Please your discussion still not interesting. Please resuscitate it.<br>The last paragraph, no need to say Results of this study contradicted with Coldron et al**., (2007)**[20] **,** you are not contradicting him personally or other surgeons who have the same opinion. Therefore, it could be better to say on the other hand other researcher (or surgeons as appropriate) believe that surgery has another advantage(s) like restoration of fascia and…. And put the three references. Then if the situation was settled it is ok, if not say further studies are required to assess whom patient with diastasis recti will benefit from physiotherapy or surgery as a primary modality. Me personally although I'm not a physiotherapist (I'm un obstetrician) I feel that physiotherapy should be tried in every case unless the patient has very large defect, cannot do or refuse it**.**<br>**References**<br><br>**Line 385, the reference was published in** 2008 May;13(2):112-21, no need to write the electronic date of publication 2007.Epub.333-348. Be careful this mistake may make some readers lose the interest in the whole paper. | |

**Reviewer Details:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Name: | **Gamal A. Kassem** |
| Department, University & Country | **Department of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Zagazig University, Egypt** |