



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJAST_17447
Title of the Manuscript:	The effects of active myofascial trigger point on anticipatory postural control
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 <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	The science of the paper is completely lost due to its poor presentation and language. There are several parameters that require to be re-written for clarity. 1. The abstract requires to be revised to inform the readers adequately about the experiment. For example, motor times requires to be defined upfront, what were the inclusion/exclusion criteria, and how was the presence of MTP determined. The results sections require to be re-written to inform the readers of the values obtained for the motor points., muscles investigated differences if any between the experimental and control groups. Most importantly the results require to be aligned with their primary objective of evaluating the effect of arm movements on anticipatory postural control in people with MTP in upper trapezius muscle. The conclusion of the abstract is vague and does not inform readers of the conclusions. Main Manuscript – 2. Introduction. The first paragraph requires restructuring to provide an accurate picture of the prevalence of MTP and pain syndromes. 3. In line 20 the authors indicate “researchers” do they mean authors? 4. In line 26 the authors mention new theory	1. My abstract is a brief of all the manuscript in which i should consider some limitations in bring number of worlds. But, i tried to modify it, as much as possible 2. I modify it, as much as possible 3. No, I had talked about authors of reference[2], [3]. 4. Reference [4] and I modify it as much as possible



SDI Review Form 1.6

	without the reference. It appears that the following sentence may be providing the information but this requires to be re-written for clarity. 5. In line 36/37 the authors indicate that impact of “control mechanisms of movement” and postures are of great significance. They need to clarify which “control” mechanism (e.g. do they mean neural control?) and why is this of “great” or clinical significance. Why should a clinician worry about such things? 6. They need to describe their primary and secondary objectives of the experiment clearly. 7. Methods section: This section requires to rewritten for clarity with better organization of sampling, outcome tools etc 8. The primary objective of measuring motor times using electromyography is poorly presented. The Authors fail to understand the difference between the “tool” EMG and the measures collected using EMG. They do not indicate whether they averaged the amplitudes of the Motor units or how they arrived at calculating the motor times. The experiment was conducted only on female participants. This should be reflected in the title as well. 9. They conducted simplistic statistics using a t test to look at the differences between the two groups. It will be valuable to look at the correlations or predictors as well that will inform the clinicians regarding strategies of treatment for females with MTP. 10. Some of the data collection procedures	5. I modified it. 6. I modified it. 7. I modified it. 8. I modified it. 9. My goal in this work was only investigation of effects of myofascial trigger point on electromyography signals between two groups that it was performed by T-Test. If your opinion is to utilize ROC Test or present of change, I will do it in the next works. Also, we calculated the effect size. Eta squared for all of variables were up 0.14 that it is large value. So T-Test used for comparing between 2 groups.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	require to be represented using figures for clarity. For example the authors could provide an image of the experimental set-up. Adequate description of the experimental procedure is one of the most important aspect of scientific writing . This is largely lacking in the current manuscript. The outcomes, tools , data collections and experimental presentations are mangled and poorly presented. The reader gets lost in this and is unable to extract the take-home message that these authors are attempting to provide through their experiment. 11. In lines 108-9 the authors talk about S1 and S2 without describing what S1 and S2 mean with reference to the experimental set up. 12. Once again The results section in the manuscript requires to be revised to adequately summarize the findings of the experiments. 13. The discussion section is vague and requires to be revised for clarity. For example the authors indicate that there is lack of studies evaluating the impact of pain on “tool” EMG. A preliminary search will indicate presence of several research articles that looked at effect of pain on motor unit potentials including trapezius. The authors require rewriting the discussions with reference to the evidence that the authors have not considered. 14. A discussion regarding the future research and clinical implications of their findings will be valuable to the readers of such experiments.	Cohen’s Eta Squared= t^2 $t^2 + (N1 + N2 - 2)$ N = number of participants t= calculated from independent T-Test table. If: Cohen’s Eta Squared= 0.01= small effect 0.06=moderate effect 0.14= large effect 10. I did it. 11. I added them in my manuscript. 12. I modified it. 13. According to your opinion to eliminate this ambiguity i used SEMG(Surface EMG) instead of EMG. SEMG or KEMG(Kinesiographical EMG) is two typical words in physical therapy papers.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	There are no ethical issues as the authors have received ethics approval from the Tehran University	14. I did it.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The manuscript has several presentation errors too numerous to state here. For example: Line 45 – “ cannot be happened” should be revised to perhaps “does not occur” Lines 66 – 71 – this is a very long sentence without appropriate use of sentence structure this requires to be revised	I corrected them. I modified it. I corrected them.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The authors should consult some one with knowledge of English language and scientific writing to present their experiment	we tried to modify the manuscript language. So we have used the presence of a native of England for editing text.