



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	Original- research

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 article is an interesting and important topic. However, it has some limitations in particular item discussion that need to be improved in order to make suitable material for publication. Abstract: You must enclose the meaning of the acronym EMG Introduction: The authors make a relevant and interesting introduction, rescuing data in the literature, etc. However could emphasize the justification of the study. Why is it important to study the issue? Method: As the sample size was set to? It would be interesting to better describe the sample ... where were they? Results: put legend in the tables Discussion: The discussion needs to be reviewed. The first paragraph should have the study's principal	- I did it. 1. I tried to correct it as much as possible - . In the beginning, we did the pilot test and then according to the standard deviation and this formula, sample size calculated. we calculated 15 participants for per group. $n = \frac{(Z_{1-\alpha/2} + Z_{1-\beta})^2 (S_d)^2}{\bar{d}^2}$ $Z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}=1.96$



SDI Review Form 1.6

	message and not the explanations of the findings ... the issue of lack of similar studies should be an advantage and not a point that prevents the discussion. The limitations should be reviewed ... the suggestion of future studies as the inclusion of other gender and other muscles is not necessarily a limitation However, a limiting factor is the convenience sample, the sample size The limiting factors were to come before the conclusion that it should respond to the objective of the study and not make inferences as the issue of rehabilitation. Another important issue is the absence of references in the discussion.	$Z_{1-\beta}=0.84$ Although after the finish our test we Also, calculated the effect size. Eta squared for all of variables were up 0.14 that it is large value. So Our sample size was sufficient 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= 0.01= small effect 0.06=moderate effect 0.14= large effect - - I modified it. - Yes, I corrected and modified it. - I try to correcting it.
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

		2. I tried to correct it as much as possible - 3. I tried to correct it as much as possible - and I added references in the discussion.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		