OPEN PEER REVIEW

Open Peer Review (OPR)

As a new feature for progressing towards transparency, we decided to open a new window for all of our editors as well as authors titled "**Open Peer Review**". We hope by this new facility, our reviewers will be more motivated and authors will be more satisfied with the review process. We believe that publishing our peer review reports could make a transparent and clear environment for all our efforts within a journal, but not all reviewers tend to publish their comments.

What is "Open Peer Review" process?

An "Open Peer Review" process is making the details of all review process (including reviewers, associate editors, and EICs comments) as "Public" as it is agreed by EIC, Authors, and reviewers.

Advantages of "Open Peer Review" process

- More transparency, constructiveness and tactful comments of the peer review process: leads to an increase in the quality of reviews
- More motivations for all involved roles in the review process
- Authors' satisfactions from the review process: Increases honesty between authors and reviewers
- Education of both authors and new students
- Prevents reviewers from following their individual agendas and leading to the detection of reviewers' conflicts of interests

You can find out more at:
https://sites.kowsarpub.com/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research
Article DOI: 10.5812/amh.104283
Published in: Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research: 18(2); e104283

Peer Review Report for "Multi-Objective Optimization Method for Posture Prediction of Symmetric Static Lifting Using a Three-Dimensional Human Model"

Author(s): Sirous Azizi, Afsaneh Dadarkhah, Alireza Asgharpour Masouleh

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 16 May 2020
Revised Date: 24 Jun 2020
Accepted Date: 1 Jul 2020

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 27 May 2020

Dear AE,
Please see the text from the perspective of writing errors.
Thanks.

Manijeh Soleimanifar: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 6 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks to the authors for their contribution and commitment to collecting important data prospectively.
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
- This article is biomechanical and informative, so if you are planning to publish in a journal other than biomechanical journals, the concepts should be written more concisely. Specifically, I put my comments in the whole text of the manuscript (the word file will be uploaded). Please study them. But in the following I summarize all comments:
- Problem statement is very week; please clarify the knowledge gap for designing this research. Strength the problem statement. Bring the aim and hypothesis of the current

paper.
- There are several terms such as MOO, DOF, DSSPP,… in the whole text, although these are very important concepts but didn't explain enough in the text. Please introduce these terms and at first write the whole term, don't use abbreviation.
- You compare your model with other model, it is important to identify the reliability and validity of your approach, also the comparing scientific results in different tables separately
- you must clarify all the items for doing the statistical method.
- Generally strength the result section and bring tables for better interpretation.
- Update your reference with more newest papers, most of your citation was for 1900- 2000
As a whole, there are extensive typos and a careful edit by strong English editors will be required
Thanks.

Rohallah Mirjani: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 6 Jun 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.
Kind regards,

Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah: EIC | **Revision (0)** 7 Jun 2020

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs major revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Alireza Asgharpour Masouleh

Alirezaasgharpoor@gmail.com

Phone: +989129314211

Dear Reviewers,

Thank you for your time and considerations. As correspond and author of the article with ID 104283, I read your comments precisely, and have corrected noted points about the article. These corrections include: updating references, describing mechanical terms as it was possible, editing the English text, adding the hypothesis, and some explanation to the introduction as you mentioned beforehand.

I am eagerly looking for your satisfaction, hope to hear more good news about my paper.

Sincerely yours,

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah: EIC | **Revision** (1) 1 Jul 2020

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.