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Author’s response to reviews:

Responses to the comments

We very much appreciated your encouraging and insightful comments and those of the referees. We have endeavored to respond to all suggestions and comments, which further improved the understanding and potential impact of our manuscript. Detailed responses are given below (in highlighted) in the revised paper We responded to the editor comments in pink, the reviewer one’s comments in yellow and the reviewer two’s comments in green. In case of further queries, we are happy to clarify any further details and look forward to your reply. We send two revised manuscripts. the paper spell checked with native editor and the certification provided for journal. We hope the second one will be more convenient for reviewers to read the answerers.

Sincerely,

authors

BMSD-D-18-00367R2

The Effect of Manual Therapy and Stabilizing Exercises on Forward Head and Rounded Shoulder Postures: a six-week intervention with a one-month follow-up study

Editor Comments:
1) Please include the name of the clinical registry along with the trial registrations number.

Response: Thank you for bringing this to our attention. This portion revised and information provided.

2) Please change the heading “Objective” in the Abstract to “Background” and ensure that the abstract is also changed in the submission system.

Response: Thank you for bringing this to our attention. This portion revised.

3) You have not referenced Figure 7 in the text.

Response: Thank you for the important comment. Following this recommendation, total parts of manuscript revised.

4) Please reorder your Declarations section to match what is outlined in our Submission Guidelines (https://bmcmusculoskeletdisord.biomedcentral.com/submission-guidelines/preparing-your-manuscript/research-article#declarations).

Response: Thank you for the important comment. Following this recommendation, we added the following paragraph:

Declarations:

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interest.

Funding

None.

Authors' contributions
KF and AL developed the review protocol. MH conducted search process and data extraction. All authors did quality appraisal of included studies and evidence synthesis as well as writing, reading and approving the final draft manuscript.

Availability of data and materials

The datasets analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Acknowledgements

None.

5) From the section “Ethics approval and consent to participate”, remove the sentence “The volunteer subject provided written consent to participate”.

Response: Grateful to the constructive criticisms of the editor, this sentence revised.

6) Several of the figures may be better presented as a single multi-panel figure, rather than individual figures.

Response: Thank you for the important comment. Following this recommendation, total parts of manuscript revised.

7) We are still noting a high text overlap for your abstract. Has your abstract previously been submitted to JMIR Research Protocols?

Response: In the light of the editor useful suggestion, we don’t publish this paper elsewhere.

8) I am afraid the quality of the English used throughout your manuscript does not currently meet our requirements. We recommend that you ask a native English speaking colleague to help you copyedit the paper. If this is not possible, you may need to use a professional language editing service. Use of an editing service is neither a requirement nor a guarantee of acceptance for publication.
Response: Authors are grateful to the editor for the positive and encouraging comments, native editors revised our manuscript and we can provide them certification letter. I hope the editor will be satisfied with the new edited article.

Reviewer 1

The writing of this manuscript needs to be corrected since there are too many mistakes. I have just pointed out some of the to be considered as examples, but the manuscript is full of them:

Abstract. Line 36: "Also. There were…"

Response: Authors are grateful to the reviewer for the positive and encouraging comments. Revision done.

Line 57: In FHP there has been seen the hyperextension

Response: The reviewer has brought up the good point and we appreciate the opportunity to clarify our research. Revision done.

Line 59. Splendid / splenius

Response: In the light of the reviewer useful suggestion. Revision done.

Line 68: there are researchers claimed considerable

Response: Authors are grateful to the reviewer for the positive and encouraging comments. Revision done.

Line 76: one of the most used interventions for improving musculoskeletal disorders is exercises therapy included a large variety

Response: The reviewer has brought up the good point and we appreciate the opportunity to clarify our research. Revision done.
Line 96: there is lack of evidence showed the effectiveness of a combined treatment like MT and SE and compared it with stabilizing intervention alone on 97 posture, function, and pain.

Response: In the light of the reviewer useful suggestion. Revision done.

Line 105: This study was a randomized control trial / controlled trial

Response: Authors are grateful to the reviewer for the positive and encouraging comments. Revision done.

Line 258: there was not seen any difference…

Response: In the light of the reviewer useful suggestion. Revision done.

The abstract, background and methods sections are quite well described. However, in the results section, in line 247, it is stated that "there was no difference between pre and post-test in the control group" with a p-value of .018. It seems that it should be corrected to 0.18.

Response: The reviewer has brought up the good point and we appreciate the opportunity to clarify our research. Revision done.

Line 250: p=016 should be corrected to 0.016

Response: Authors are grateful to the reviewer for the positive and encouraging comments. Revision done.

In the discussion section, in line 317, it is stated that "it can be inferred that the statistically advantages of group 2 compairing to the group 1 in function improvement and pain reduction…". I think the advantage belongs to group 1 (MT + SE) to group 2 (SE). According to the abstract and line 144, group 1 received SE + MT, and group 2 received SE. This mistake also happens in line 357, where it is stated that the improvement in function was more effective in group 2 than in group 1.

Response: The reviewer has brought up the good point and we appreciate the opportunity to clarify our research. Revision done.
Limitation 2: the fact that the manual therapist was an accredited one is not a limitation. It is obvious that the results of many interventions (especially physical interventions such as surgery and manual therapies) depend on the ability of the professional who develops them, so this limitation should be eliminated.

Response: In the light of the reviewer useful suggestion. Revision done.

Limitation 3: Why do the authors state that the control group was not considered to be a peer group? I do not understand this limitation. I think it must be eliminated. According to the flow diagram, the control group is constituted by subjects who fit the same criteria than the other groups, and according to line 238, there were no differences in the characteristics of subjects for any of the variables. So I cannot understand why this group is not considered to be a peer group.

Response: The reviewer has brought up the good point and we appreciate the opportunity to clarify our research. Revision done.

Authors are encouraged to use more recent references when possible, since many of them are not especially new. The format of the references should be reviewed and corrected.

Response: Authors are grateful to the reviewer for the positive and encouraging comments. Revision done.

Flow diagram: It should be added that the photogrammetry is the reason why from 80 subjects assessed for eligibility, only 60 were randomized.

Response: In the light of the reviewer useful suggestion. Revision done.

Flow diagram: the lowest blue bar should be filled showing any information. I suppose that it refers to the one month-follow-up. Anyway, it seems that it could be eliminated since it does not give new information.

Response: In the light of the reviewer useful suggestion. Revision done.

Figure 2 should show the acromion point, because it cannot be seen.
Response: The reviewer has brought up the good point and we appreciate the opportunity to clarify our research. Revision done.

Reviewer 2

Methods

Page 6, 122th line: "werer" is adequate word?
Response: In the light of the reviewer useful suggestion. Revision done.

Page 7, 150th line: VAS score were around 5 point in baseline measurement. It is questionable that the subjects didn't take any pills for reducing the pain.
Response: In the light of the reviewer useful suggestion, the participant did not report the use of any pill.

Page 8, 167th line: Would you please know us the unit of the measurement variable "PILE"?, (time or score etc..)
Response: The reviewer has brought up the good point and we appreciate the opportunity to clarify our research. Revision done. We mentioned the units in table 4 and 5.

Page 8, 177th line: Is there any normative value of the FSA or FHA? If it is present, it might be benefit for suggesting the value and comparing measured value of the present study.
Response: Authors are grateful to the reviewer for the positive and encouraging comments. Revision done and normative values for FSA or FHA added to article.
Page 8, 10th line: Why didn't author describe the direction or intensity of the manual therapy intervention for neck region?

Response: In the light of the reviewer useful suggestion, we cannot find this at Page 8, 10th line.

Results

Page 11, 235th line: Suggesting the normal distribution of the data might be appropriate.

Response: In the light of the reviewer useful suggestion. Revision done.

Page 11, 235th line: There were no measured mean data in this study, but exist the mean differences. Absence of the mean data of the VAS might be OK. However, Functional endurance mean data and posture measuring mean data is necessary, because the values were not general variables.

Response: The reviewer has brought up the good point and we appreciate the opportunity to clarify our research. Revision done.

Page 11, 235th line: In method, authors describe the performance of the power analysis. Then it would be appropriate for suggesting effect size of the statics in results section.

Response: Authors are grateful to the reviewer for the positive and encouraging comments. Revision done.

DISCUSSION

Page 13, 296th line: SE group performed the exercises inducing scapular protraction as well as retraction. Why author describe the middle part of trapezius does not have any role to upwardly rotate the scapula?

Response: In the light of the reviewer useful suggestion, we used direct suggestion of previous studies results and this sentence does not direct result of our study. However if the reviewer wants, we can delete if.

Page 13, 293th line: The study of the "Inman et al (1944)" is the major scientific evidence related shoulder kinesiology. However, there are many recent kinematic researches and electromyography researches related shoulder joint.
Response: The reviewer has brought up the good point and we appreciate the opportunity to clarify our research. Revision done and this part of manuscript revised.

Page 13, 299th line: Did the Gong (2015) measure EMG activity? In my opinion, reference of the reference is not appropriate. There are many similar examples in this study.

Response: In the light of the reviewer useful suggestion, we used different citation for this part.