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://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/mejrh.115185
Published in: Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies: 8(4); e115185

Peer Review Report for "Reliability and Validity of the Tampa Scale of Kinesiophobia Questionnaire in Individuals with Non-specific Low Back Pain"

Author(s): Mohsen Abedi, Farshad Okhovatian, Maryam Heydarpour Meymeh, Aliyeh Daryabor, Alireza Akbarzadeh Baghban

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 11 Apr 2021
Revised Date: 2 Sep 2021
Accepted Date: 20 Sep 2021

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) — 25 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
The article evaluated the Reliability and Validity of the Tampa Scale of Kinesiophobia Questionnaire in Individuals with Non-Specific Low-Back Pain.
The research method and statistical methods used have been selected correctly. The article is accepted.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 20 Jun 2021

Dear EIC,
This manuscript is aimed to explore the Reliability and Validity of the Tampa Scale of Kinesiophobia
Questionnaire in Individuals with Non-Specific Low-Back Pain.
The manuscript is written well. And also all parts of the manuscript are well organized according to the scientific points.

After careful review, I and one of our expert reviewer have decided to accept the manuscript just after a native ENGLISH revision. some points in the manuscript needs revision according to the English writing language.
Thanks.

Fatemeh Ehsani: EIC | **Revision (0)** 29 Jun 2021

Dear Authors
Thank you for the improvement of the quality of the article. However, some grammatical problems are still observed in the manuscript. It is suggested that the article be edited by the native editor and sent the confirmation letter for the journal.
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.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

The article evaluated the Reliability and Validity of the Tampa Scale of Kinesiophobia Questionnaire in Individuals with Non-Specific Low-Back Pain.

The research method and statistical methods used have been selected correctly. The article is accepted.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

This manuscript is aimed to explore the Reliability and Validity of the Tampa Scale of Kinesiophobia Questionnaire in Individuals with Non-Specific Low-Back Pain.

The manuscript is written well. And also all parts of the manuscript are well organized according to the scientific points.

After careful review, I and one of our expert reviewer have decided to accept the manuscript just after a native ENGLISH revision. some points in the manuscript needs revision according to the English writing language.

EIC Decision:

Dear Authors

Thank you for improvement of quality of article. However, some grammatical problems are still observed in the manuscript. It is suggested that the article is edited by native editor and send the confirmation letter for journal.

Dear reviewers and dear editor

Thanks so much for your positive attitude regarding our manuscript. **Since the only reviewers' comment was for English edit of manuscript**, we asked an expert person to edit all document. So, we made sure that this manuscript's English quality is acceptable now.

Yours Sincerely,

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 18 Sep 2021

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

Fatemeh Ehsani: EIC | **Revision** (1) 20 Sep 2021

Dear Authors
We are pleased to inform you that your article is accepted for publication in the MEJRHS.
We hope to receive the other qualified articles from your group.
Thanks.