



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJAST_17447
Title of the Manuscript:	The effects of active myofascial trigger point on anticipatory postural control
Type of the Article	Validation study

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The aim of the study is on validation of EMG in patients (women) with MTP although the authors do not describe the aim very clearly. The study has a lot of methodological limitations. The aim of the study is not clearly formulated. There are no exact hypotheses formulated. The recruitment and sample size (very homogenous {why?} and very small) is not clearly deribed . Sample size calculation? The comparison of the measures must clearly be discussed. MECT? Analyses must fit to the method section for !00%. but it is not clear why they perform some tests. The conclusion should cover the results and that is not the case. Conclusions in the abstract must be removed. There are not according the presented dates.	1. I performed your advises as much as possible . A Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) test was used to determine the normal distribution of each variable. the statistical independent t- test was, also, applied to compare variables between two groups. After calculated t-test we also calculated effect size. Eta squared for all of variables were up 0.14. that it is large value, so T-Test is a valid test for showing differences between two groups. Cohen's Eta Squared= $\frac{t^2}{t^2 + (N1 + N2 - 2)}$ N = number of participants t= calculated from independent T-Test table. If: Cohen's Eta Squared=



SDI Review Form 1.6

		0.01= small effect 0.06=moderate effect 0.14= large effect
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Titel and Abstract: Remove the word “effects” That is confusing because the reader expects a RCT then. Abstract: Conclusion. Remove the word “evaluation” and use a description like “investigation of the influence”. Include a commend on the very small female sample size. That is a limitation of the findings Introduction: 18: 45-55 % of what...?, in pain patients, or within the normal population? 20: remove “researchers believe” 22: remove “significant source”(not an acceptable term) 46-47: reformulate the aim of the study. Remove toe word effects and give information about the comparison group. Methods: 48: start with a description about the type of study design 50-52: Give insight information about the recruitment strategy of all prticipants. Describe collection of describtieve variables of the study population. if not done and if not why not 53: Is there an medical Ethical Approval for the study? 55: Inclusion criteria are not mentioned 63-65: Please explain why participants were not allowed to eat or drink coffe on the day of the experiment	I modified it. 1. I corrected it as as much as possible 48: I performed it 50-52: They all signed the informed consentiment before taking part in this study until they be informed of all steps of this study. This work is essential stage in all of clinical studies that it must be performed to take the medical Ethical Approval. This form hasn’t any descriptive variables. 53: yes, I add this in manuscript. 55: I wrote inclusion criteria in 55- 78 line but I inserted them in the table for more understanding. 63-65: because eating and drinking coffee may be effected on the electromyography signals.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Analyses: 117: Start with results of the recruitment strategy and description of the study population 133 Make clear why the authors wanted an accurate matching and performed t-test on variables as age, height and weight. Why these variables? Why t-tests? Does it make sense in such a small sample size? Study limitations 186: The authors should elaborate much more about the limitations of this study. The very small sample size (and only young women) is a large problem. The methodological limitations in the design of the study regarding recruitment, sample size, description of the sample size, should be discussed. De conclusion 186 is not relevant. Please formulate one that fits to the dates	This factor is as the one of inclusion criteria in reference 26 and 27. 1. 117. I modified it as much as possible 133. In this study are two groups, Control and patient. Our goal is investigation of differences between two groups so matching of age, height and weight between two groups and having homogenous samples before starting study are important factors. K-S test was not significant for all variables therefore we can assume that all of variables is normal and we can use of parametric test for analysis. T-Test is a valid test for showing differences between two groups. Because 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. We used the book "SPSS survival manual" write by "Julie Pallant". Third edition, page 234-236. Also We utilize the book "physical therapy research principles an applications" write by "Elizabeth Domholdt" for using of all of statistical analysis. Cohen's Eta Squared= $\frac{t^2}{t^2 + (N1 + N2 - 2)}$ N = number of participants t= calculated from independent T-Test table.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

		If: Cohen's Eta Squared= 0.01= small effect 0.06=moderate effect 0.14= large effect We used of young women, because pain pressure threshold Is different in sex and various ages. Fisher and et al 1987. "Pressure algometry over normal muscle. Standard values, validity and reproducibility of pressure threshold". Pain 186. I modified it as it possible it.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The methodological structure of the paper is far below an acceptable level. Many parts are not described and the authors introduced a considerable bias by using such a small homogenous sample withat explaining why they did that. Thje aim , hypotheses, design description and choice of the statistics re not clearly discussed or not mentioned at all. Conclusion does not fit with the dates	I tried to record and modify my manuscript based on your opinion.