



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMMR_21551
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Postural Stability in Pregnant Women
Type of the 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Review of paper Title: Evaluation of Postural Stability in Pregnant Women General Comments: The paper represents an important idea that must be explored and published. The implications and significance of these findings will benefit humanity. Specific Comments: Abstract - Reads well, however with recommended changes to the results, there will some minor editing required. Introduction - Reads well. - Line 36, "The maintenance of , . . ." grammar revision required.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Methodology

- Reads well.
- Line 51 change “February 2015 to July 2015” to “February to July 2015”.
- Include which Biodex proprioceptive protocol used.

Results

I recommend that the author/s re-construct the tables, in order to increase the validity of the findings. The authors should consider the following;

Group 1 are the pregnant females in 2nd trimester

Group 2 are the pregnant females in 3rd trimester

Intervention 1 is the measure of the proprioception at level 8

Intervention 2 is the measure of the proprioception at level 7

The authors need to perform within groups and between groups comparison to increase validity of findings. Further the author can perform an ANNOVA test to determine significance among the OA, AP and ML scores. This will definitely improve the quality of the statistics.

The tables can be constructed as:

Table 1. The comparative proprioceptive balance of 2nd trimester females at level 8 and 7 (within group analyses)

Stability Index	Level 8	Level 7	P-value
Over all	3.35(1.14)	4.8(0.4)	
AP	3.82(1.15)	5.1(1.2)	
ML	2.14(0.6)	2.8(1.4)	

Table 2. The comparative proprioceptive balance of 3rd trimester females at level 8 and 7 (within group analyses)



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Stability Index	Level 8	Level 7	P-value
	Over all	5.36(1.12)	6.9(1.04)	
	AP	4.8(0.16)	6.7(1.13)	
	ML	4.15(0.6)	4.5(1.01)	
	Table 3. The comparative proprioceptive balance of 2 nd versus 3 rd trimester pregnant females at level 8 (between groups' analyses)			
	Stability Index	2 nd trimester	3 rd trimester	P-value
	Over all	3.35 (1.4)	5.36(1.12)	
	AP	3.82(1.15)	4.8(0.16)	
	ML	2.14(0.6)	4.15(0.6)	
	Table 4. The comparative proprioceptive balance of 2 nd versus 3 rd trimester pregnant females at level 7 (between groups' analyses)			
	Stability Index	2 nd trimester	3 rd trimester	P-value
	Over all	4.8(0.9)	6.9(1.04)	
	AP	5.1(1.2)	6.7(1.3)	
	ML	2.8(1.4)	4.5(1.01)	
	ANNOVA	??	??	
PS: the authors can compare 2 nd trimester level 7 performance using an ANNOVA. Thereafter compare the 2 nd versus the 3 rd ANNOVA balance score. This can be done for all tables.				
Minor REVISION comments				
Optional/General comments				

Reviewer Details:

Name:	TJ Ellapen
Department, University & Country	University of Kwa Zulu Natal, South Africa