



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Annual Review & Research in Biology |
| Manuscript Number: | 2013_ARRB_6404 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Modeling of the effect of backpack load position on the lumbar spine curvature |
| Type of the Article | Research Paper |

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 | <p>The abstract must be structured (Aim, Methodology, etc) References must be numbered in the order they appear in the text There are many incorrect sentences (no spacing between many words) (eg.: "movedbystudents") The authors mentioned in the Introduction that most of the studies are done empirically: give brief examples of these studies. Many sentences in Introduction should be better placed in the Discussion section.</p> <p>The authors mentioned the G and H angle in the Results without present what they represent in Methods. Once G and H angles are used in the literature, they should be explained on details. Results are presented in a confusing manner. They should be explained in details for readers who are not familiar with the terms used. Finally, the authors reported that the Aim of the study was to calculate the lumbar spine curvature in standing with a loaded backpack (abstract). I think the aim of the study is to propose a simulated model for predict the lumbar spine curvature, as stated in Introduction and Conclusion.</p> | <p>The authors thank the reviewers for their comments, and are pleased that the reviewers are satisfied with all the changes made to the manuscript following the original review.</p> <p>Below we reply to the new point raised, by Reviewer, following that reviewer's re-review of the manuscript. All changes are highlighted in the manuscript.</p> <p><u>Reply to reviewer</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Abstract and references have amended (see abstract and references). -Incorrect sentences have amended. -Some sentences of introduction have placed in the discussion section. (see page 9, line 38) -The G and H angles were introduced (see method and material, page 3, line 8) -The results have amended to be more clarified (see page 4, line 18) -The aim of the study has amended as the reviewer kindly suggested (see abstract: Aims section), (see introduction: the end paragraph), (see conclusion section: first line). |



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | | |
| <u>Minor</u> REVISION comments | | |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | After revision of all compulsory revisions the article should be revised again. | |