

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	<a href="#">Disease and Health Research: New Insights</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2255
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness of the Otaria's Postpartum Gymnastic Model and Caregiver Assistance on Decreasing of Uterine Fundal Height in Postpartum Mothers
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The importance of having a non-traumatic method of returning to the normal height of the uterus is fundamental for the well-being of the woman who has given birth.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Some correlation analysis, logistic regression and association tests would be missing	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Updated references after 2018 are missing	

[Review Form2](#)

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The interpretation of methods should be clarified and the results in the tables should be better clarified.</p> <p><b>If you could clarify the t test, because according to the test it is not significant. The same thing happens until day 7. What is marked in red is referred to F, not to the student's t value.</b></p> <p><b>Table Analyzed            Unpaired t test data day 3</b></p> <p><b>Column B    control</b>  <b>vs.    vs,</b>  <b>Column A    treatment</b></p> <p><b>Unpaired t test</b>  <b>P value        0,7233</b>  <b>P value summary    ns</b>  <b>Significantly different? (P &lt; 0.05)    No</b>  <b>One- or two-tailed P value?    Two-tailed</b>  <b>t, df    t=0,3546 df=158</b></p> <p><b>How big is the difference?</b>  <b>Mean ± SEM of column A    4,340 ± 2,020 N=80</b>  <b>Mean ± SEM of column B    3,490 ± 1,290 N=80</b>  <b>Difference between means    -0,8500 ± 2,397</b>  <b>95% confidence interval    -5,584 to 3,884</b>  <b>R square        0,0007954</b></p> <p><b>F test to compare variances</b>  <b>F,DFn, Dfd    2,452, 79, 79</b>  <b>P value        &lt; 0,0001</b>  <b>P value summary        ****</b>  <b>Significantly different? (P &lt; 0.05)    Yes</b></p>	

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> (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>
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Agustin Joison</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Cordoba Catholic University, Argentina</b></p>