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.101969
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 7(2); e101969

Peer Review Report for "Autonomic Modulation Improves in Response to Harder Performances While Playing Wind Instruments"

Author(s): Cristina Blasco-Lafarga, Cristina García-Soriano, Pablo Monteagudo

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 17 Feb 2020
Revised Date: 14 Mar 2020
Accepted Date: 17 Mar 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) 6 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
The manuscript introduces an interesting and new research issue (i.e., autonomic modulation during playing music) for the specifics fields of psychophysiology and neurosciences, music and sports sciences. This topic can be of great importance in the future, as there is a lack of research focused on health benefits of music. Overall the study, in my opinion, addresses an interesting and emerging issues for the literature and reveals new findings from with holistic academic perspective. However, despite these strengths, I have some (short) theoretical and methodological concerns/questions that I tried to summarize in the comments for authors, and that I think can help to increase the validity and quality of the manuscript. I hope you can find these comments helpful.
- The first and basic concern it is related to the absence of a table (or a sentence) that summarizes the characteristics of participants (age, weight, heart rate or RRi at least). From my point of view, this is basic in all research articles. Besides the type of study must be specified.
- On the other hand, I would like more about the eligibility or inclusion criteria.
- Could be possible that the level of study (professionals or students) is a potential source of bias? If you think that this is possible, add this in the limitations section.
- A second set of concerns is related to some minor corrections (page, paragraph, line

where the authors must make the corrections) that I summarized below:
- “On the other hand, besides being an artistic and pleasant activity, music playing has the potential to induce cardiovascular benefits similar to exercise, specially cardio-protection”: ESPECIALLY.
- “Whether an strenuous autonomic strain due to higher requirements is one path by which playing music exerts its therapeutic effect on cardiovascular health”: A.
- “The thrust of the diaphragmatic musculature in the expiration activates the vagus nerve endings (11, 15), what would explain these parasympathetic reactivation”: THIS.
- Finally, as reported here, appears to suggest that current findings are somewhat nebulous and global, it seems sensible of the authors to isolate the areas on which they intend to focus. Such findings would I believe be valuable in contributing to a research template which might be filled by them and others committed to this field. Consequently, in my opinion, the manuscript should be accept for publication in the Journal after these minor revision. Finally I want to congratulate the authors for the idea and the interpretation of the results reflect in the discussion section. I really think is very interesting. Such findings would I believe be valuable in contributing to a research template which might be filled by them and others committed to this field.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 11 Mar 2020

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 11 Mar 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.

Dear Editor:

Here you have the response to reviewers of the manuscript

Ref.: 101969

Entitled:

"AUTONOMIC MODULATION IMPROVES IN RESPONSE TO HARDER PERFORMANCES WHILE PLAYING WIND INSTRUMENTS"

Following the advice in your mail, we modified the manuscript, working to improve its quality and validity. These revisions, response the questions of the reviewer. We have finally decided to answer point by point their comments, together with some clarifying explanations with regards to the current version of the manuscript. We have underlined in yellow sentences, paragraphs and changes made in the new version.

Response to Reviewer 1:

Dear reviewer:

We appreciate your comments and your positive review on our manuscript. We thank you very much for your guidance and suggestions, which have been very helpful. We hope that we have answered all your doubts.

In response to "The first and basic concern it is related to the absence of a table (or a sentence) that summarizes the characteristics of participants (age, weight, heart rate or RRi at least). From my point of view, this is basic in all research articles":

You are right. We have added a new table (table 2) with main participants characteristics. In this table you can find new health variables like blood pressure, arterial oxygen saturation and others (body composition and heart rate variability). Besides, we have explain the data collection of these variables in the material and methods section.

In response to "the type of study must be specified".

Thank you for your comment we have add this in the first part of the materials and methods section:

> *"8 male, healthy, wind instrument musicians (29.13 ± 7.33 years; 69.36 ± 10.31 kg; resting RRi: 915 ± 147 ms), participated in this quantitative study with a no-experimental, cross-sectional and descriptive design".*

In response to "I would like more about the elegibility or inclusion criteria. Could be possible that the level of study (professionals or students) is a potential source of bias? If you think that this is possible, add this in the limitations section":

We have detailed the inclusion and exclusion criteria in *participants and protocol section:*

> *"Inclusion criteria were: (1) Age between 20 and 50 years; (2) male gender; (3) to play a wind instrument; and (4) professionals or students of the Local Conservatory in their last year. Exclusion criteria were: (1) to play organ,*

accordion or harmonium (wind instrument but do not sound by blowing air); and (2) miss 1 day of assessment."

Regarding potential source of bias, from our point of view the level of musicians was similar, so we have included this argument in the limitations of the study but thinking that future studies should investigate if music evokes these benefits in different levels of academic degree.

In response to the minor revisions:

- "On the other hand, besides being an artistic and pleasant activity, music playing has the potential to induce cardiovascular benefits similar to exercise, specially cardio-protection": ESPECIALLY. **CHANGED.**
- "Whether an strenuous autonomic strain due to higher requirements is one path by which playing music exerts its therapeutic effect on cardiovascular health": A. **CHANGED.**
- "The thrust of the diaphragmatic musculature in the expiration activates the vagus nerve endings (11, 15), what would explain these parasympathetic reactivation": THIS. **CHANGED.**

We hope our revision is properly due. We want to thank you very much for this opportunity, and for the good quality of your reviewer comments which have guided this review. Please, don't hesitate to contact us for any further question.

Yours sincerely
The authors

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) — 16 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
The authors have performed the suggested changes. The manuscript is ready for publication in its present version.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 17 Mar 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 17 Mar 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.