Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research
Volume 19 · Issue 4 · e119760
OPEN PEER REVIEW

Effects of Eight-Week Combined (Resistance and Endurance) Training on Serum Levels of Prostate Specific Antigen (PSA), Sex Hormone Binding Globulin (SHBG), and Phosphatase and Tensin Homolog (PTEN) in Men with Prostate Cancer

Abbas Jafari, Hamid Arazi, Amirabbas Monazzami, Alireza Ghadian, Kambiz Hasrak

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
21 Sep 2021	28 Nov 2021	28 Nov 2021	10.5812/amh.119760

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Afagh Hassanzadeh Rad, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 6
3 **Revision 2** Editor-in-Chief 7
Authors' reply to reviewers 8
Reviewer and editor comments 10

1 Original submission

2 comments · 7 Oct 2021 – 9 Nov 2021

Afagh Hassanzadeh Rad Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 7 Oct 2021

Dear Editor in chief,
I received the manuscript and have the following comments:
The authors have to spell out each term at first use, indicate its abbreviation, and use the abbreviation thereafter throughout the abstract and main text. The abstract should be treated separately from the main text in this regard.
Keywords should be based on MESH.
It would be better to mention the necessity of this study in the final paragraph of the Introduction.
It is better to mention the mean age, weight, etc., in the results section instead of the methods section.
It would be better if the authors clearly defined the duration of the pre-examination and post-examination periods.
Describe the control group and the assessments needed for this group.
Replace table 1. It seems that the authors did not mention it in the text.
Mention some descriptive results for demographic characteristics in the first part of the results section instead.
Modify the references based on the preferred style.
with regards

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 9 Nov 2021

minor revision

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear Editor

I would like to thank you and your reviewers for his/her good comments regarding our study, which allow us to improve this manuscript. We insert some parts of these explanations and advice into the manuscript. Answers to the reviewer's comments are presented below.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

1. it is better to measure anaerobic threshold and VCO2 in rest and training state

Response: Many thanks for your suggestion. However, the physical condition caused by the disease did not allow for high-intensity activity, so the protocol used was adopted according to ACSM guidelines.

Reviewer2:

1. *1. Authors have to mention the complete word for the first time and indicate the abbreviations and use it after that in all abstract and main text. The abstract should be separated from the main text in this case.*

Response: Many thanks for your suggestion. It was mentioned In abstract And other parts that were needed.

2. *Keywords should be based on MESH*

Response: Many thanks for your suggestion . It was mentioned and Corrected in the article.

3. It would be better to mention the necessity of this study as the final paragraph of the Introduction.

Response: Many thanks for your suggestion. It was mentioned the final paragraph of the Introduction.

4. It is better to mention mean age, weight, etc in the results section instead of methods.
Response: Many thanks for your suggestion . It was mentioned and your suggestion And was placed in the first paragraph of the results section.
5. It would be better if the authors completely define the duration of pre-examination and post-examination.
Response: Many thanks for your suggestion. In the second paragraph, the method section, lines 5 and 6 were mentioned.

6. Describe the control group and the assessments needed for this group.

Response: Many thanks for your suggestion. *the assessments needed for control group* In the first paragraph of the method section, line 5-7 was explained.

7. Replace table 1. It seems that the authors did not mention it in the text.

Response: Many thanks for your suggestion . In the first paragraph of the method section, line 5 referred to Table 1.

8. Mention some descriptive results of demographic characteristics as the first part of the results section instead.

Response: Many thanks for your suggestion. some descriptive results of demographic characteristics were given in the first paragraph of the results section.

9. Modify the references based on the preferred style.
Response: Many thanks for your suggestion.The references are based on the Vancouver format in the journal's authors' guidelines.

Best Regards

A.jafari

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 26 Nov 2021

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 26 Nov 2021

Informed Consent: Not OK

Authors should obtain written informed consent signed by the study participants or patients and should upload a copy of the informed consent form to the journal website. Some samples of informed consent can be found here.

Informed consent and other ethical considerations should be mentioned on the journal website or in the text of the manuscript: Read more here.

* Please write meaningful and complete sentences and do not use ambiguous phrases such as "No" or "None Declared".

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear Editor

I would like to thank you and your reviewers for his/her good comments regarding our study, which allow us to improve this manuscript. We insert some parts of these explanations and advice into the manuscript. Answers to the reviewer's comments are presented below.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

1. it is better to measure anaerobic threshold and VCO2 in rest and training state

Response: Many thanks for your suggestion. However, the physical condition caused by the disease did not allow for high-intensity activity, so the protocol used was adopted according to ACSM guidelines.

Reviewer2:

1. *1. Authors have to mention the complete word for the first time and indicate the abbreviations and use it after that in all abstract and main text. The abstract should be separated from the main text in this case.*

Response: Many thanks for your suggestion. It was mentioned In abstract And other parts that were needed.

2. *Keywords should be based on MESH*

Response: Many thanks for your suggestion . It was mentioned and Corrected in the article.

3. It would be better to mention the necessity of this study as the final paragraph of the Introduction.

Response: Many thanks for your suggestion. It was mentioned the final paragraph of the Introduction.

4. It is better to mention mean age, weight, etc in the results section instead of methods.
Response: Many thanks for your suggestion . It was mentioned and your suggestion And was placed in the first paragraph of the results section.
5. It would be better if the authors completely define the duration of pre-examination and post-examination.
Response: Many thanks for your suggestion. In the second paragraph, the method section, lines 5 and 6 were mentioned.

6. Describe the control group and the assessments needed for this group.

Response: Many thanks for your suggestion. *the assessments needed for control group* In the first paragraph of the method section, line 5-7 was explained.

7. Replace table 1. It seems that the authors did not mention it in the text.

Response: Many thanks for your suggestion . In the first paragraph of the method section, line 5 referred to Table 1.

8. Mention some descriptive results of demographic characteristics as the first part of the results section instead.

Response: Many thanks for your suggestion. some descriptive results of demographic characteristics were given in the first paragraph of the results section.

9. Modify the references based on the preferred style.
Response: Many thanks for your suggestion.The references are based on the Vancouver format in the journal's authors' guidelines.

Best Regards

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 28 Nov 2021

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 28 Nov 2021

accept