

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_115114
Title of the Manuscript:	Do dynamometric variables of the pelvic floor muscles differ between women with and without stress urinary incontinence? A blind, cross-sectional study.
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, this study is important because it compares pelvic floor muscle function in women with and without stress urinary incontinence (SUI). This information can help improve how we diagnose and treat SUI, which affects many women worldwide.</p> <p>The title, "Do dynamometric variables of the pelvic floor muscles differ between women with and without stress urinary incontinence? A blind, cross-sectional study," is clear and accurately describes what the study is about.</p> <p>The abstract gives a good summary of the study, covering its objectives, methods, results, and conclusions effectively.</p> <p>The manuscript is well-organized with clear sections like Introduction, Methods, Results, and Conclusion, making it easy to follow.</p> <p>The study seems scientifically sound, with a good design, methods, and analysis. The results and discussion are presented clearly, making it easy to understand.</p> <p>The references provided are relevant, but it's always good to include the most recent studies to support the findings further. Adding recent systematic reviews or meta-analyses could enhance the paper.</p> <p>However, need to address all the below mentioned suggestions too</p> <p>Abstract: Ensure consistency in the abbreviation of pelvic floor muscles (PFM) throughout the abstract. You use both "PFM" and "PFMs." Choose one abbreviation and stick with it for clarity.</p> <p>Introduction: Consider breaking down the introduction into smaller, more focused paragraphs to improve readability. Clarify the abbreviation "SUI" immediately after its first use. Define it as stress urinary incontinence for readers who may not be familiar with the term.</p> <p>Materials and Methods: The sample size calculation section is clear, but consider breaking it into bullet points or steps for easier readability. Consider providing more detail about the inclusion and exclusion criteria to give readers a clearer understanding of the study population. In the blinding section, clarify the roles of each evaluator (Evaluator 1, Evaluator 2, Evaluator 3) in the study process.</p> <p>Results: Tables should be referenced in the text before they appear. Ensure that Table 1 and Table 2 are referenced in the Results section before they are presented.</p> <p>Discussion: In the first paragraph, clarify the abbreviation "PFM" immediately after its first use. Define it as pelvic floor muscles for clarity. Consider breaking down the discussion into smaller subsections to address specific aspects of the findings, such as the lack of significant differences in PFM contraction force between groups and the implications for physiotherapy practice. Provide more explicit connections between the study's findings and their clinical implications. How do the results contribute to our understanding of SUI diagnosis and treatment?</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Implications for physiotherapy practice: Provide more detailed recommendations for physiotherapy practice based on the study findings. How can clinicians use this information to improve their assessment and treatment of women with SUI?</p> <p>Research limitations: Consider expanding on the potential implications of the age and parity differences between the groups. How might these factors have influenced the study findings? Discuss any other limitations of the study design or methodology that could have influenced the results.</p> <p>Conclusions: Summarize the key findings of the study clearly and concisely in the conclusions section. Provide more explicit recommendations for future research based on the study's limitations and areas for further investigation.</p> <p>General: Check for consistency in terminology, abbreviations, and formatting throughout the manuscript. Proofread the manuscript for grammar, punctuation, and spelling errors.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Review the language for clarity and conciseness. Some sentences could be simplified for easier comprehension.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kamalakannan M
Department, University & Country	Saveetha College of Physiotherapy, Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Sciences, India