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

Archives of Neuroscience
Article DOI: 10.5812/ans.106242
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 8(1); e106242

Peer Review Report for "Postural Stability in Individuals with and without Sacroiliac Joint Dysfunction Before and After Pelvic Belt Application"

Author(s): Rahimeh Mahmoodi, Gholam Reza Olyaei , Saeed Talebian, Azadeh Shadmehr, Nastaran Ghotbi, Mohammad Reza Hadian

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 10 Jun 2020
Revised Date: 31 Oct 2020
Accepted Date: 9 Nov 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) — 11 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
It is a good study about sacroiliac pain and the effect of the sacroiliac belts on it.
- The authors should write the discussion part more completely.
- The manuscript needs an English edit.
- The result section in the abstract should be explained more.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 2 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
Reading throughout the manuscript, I found a rather solid and strong study.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 6 Sep 2020

Dear AE,

This is a valuable study. There are some points regarding the article.

1. The author should explain more about the control group. If they are completely healthy, he/she should mention this in the method.

2. What the reason of age range that the author selected is

3. It's necessary to explain more about the pelvic belt. The material, custom made /prefabricated,…..& add the image of it in the article.

4. The conclusion of the abstract has not resulted from the article & needs correction.

Thanks indeed.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 6 Sep 2020

Dear EIC,

The manuscript needs minor revision.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 6 Sep 2020

Dear Author,

Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor 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.

Reviewer1: Reading throughout the manuscript, I fund a rather solid and strong study.

Answer: This study, as a part of our research to evaluate postural stability parameters

Reviewer2: Please write the discussion part more completely.

Many researchers have reported that any deficit in muscular and neural elements has been associated with reduced postural stability in LBP group (20). This was due to take the strategy of trunk stiffening as a protective mechanism for balance maintenance (27).

Rewiewer3:

1- The author should explain more about the control group. If they are completely healthy, he/she should mention in the method.

Answer: Group II has included nineteen healthy individuals.

2- What the reason of age range that the author selected is

Answer: Age ranged from twenty to forty-two as the age range to be active physically,

3- it's necessary to explain more about the pelvic belt. The material, custom made /prefabricated,…..& add the image of it in the article.

Answer: All participants repeated six more attempts with a nonelastic, 10 centimeters width custom made pelvic belt.

Belt picture (see Fig.2).

4- The conclusion of the abstract has not resulted from the article & needs correction.

Answer: Abstract conclusion: It seems pain could lead to the postural sway into instability and change the motor control strategy. The proprioception signals from the neuromuscular system of SIJ had improved after PB. Therefore, PB as a feasible tool can be recommended for PC improvement.

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.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 19 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks for the corrections made in the text, In the case of a belt photo, please use a high-quality photo of the belt that the authors used for their patients.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 19 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
The image of the pelvic belt does not have good quality.
Other corrections are acceptable.
Thanks indeed.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 24 Oct 2020

Dear EIC,
The authors should improve the quality of image.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 24 Oct 2020

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

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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.

Reviewer1*:* Thanks for the corrections made in the text, In the case of a belt photo, please use a high-quality photo of the belt that you used for your patients.

Answer: It was uploaded a new high quality photo of the belt that we used in our study.

Reviewer2: The image of the pelvic belt does not have good quality. Other corrections are acceptable.

Answer: It was uploaded a new high quality photo of the belt that we used in our study.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) — 2 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
All corrections are acceptable.
Sincerely yours.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) — 4 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
At now, this study is suitable for publishing in your valuable journal.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) — 9 Nov 2020

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) — 9 Nov 2020

Dear Author
Based on your answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.