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

Asian Journal of Sports Medicine
Article DOI: 10.5812/asjsm.100261
Published in: Asian Journal of Sports Medicine: 11(2); e100261

Peer Review Report for "Physical Health Status of Emergency Care Providers in South Africa"

Author(s): Solomon Mthombeni, Yoga Coopoo, Habib Noorbhai

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 25 Dec 2019
Revised Date: 5 Apr 2020
Accepted Date: 16 Apr 2020

Revision (0)

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

Morteza Taheri: Reviewer | Revision (0)

16 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
There are some points needed to be answered and corrected by the authors as follow:
- Abstract: ECPs should be written in full name and then abbreviation. what was the rational for recruiting 90 subjects? why too much difference in number of males and females?. how about measuring other lipid profiles?if not possible, include in study limitations. results and statistics should be reported in findings of abstract. report P values.
- Introduction: better to focus more on the effects of Fat percent and WHR on health. since they can directly affect other parameters that you measured such as Blood pressure, soon. you can use the following references:
Lee, Joung-Won et al. “Anthropometric indices as predictors of hypertension among men and women aged 40-69 years in the Korean population: the Korean Genome and Epidemiology Study.” BMC public health vol. 15 140. 13 Feb. 2015, doi:10.1186/s12889-015-1471-5
Irandoust K, Taheri M. The Effect of Vitamin D supplement and Indoor Vs Outdoor Physical Activity on Depression of Obese Depressed Women, Asian J Sports Med. 2017 ; 8(3):e13311. doi: 10.5812/asjsm.13311.
- Method: what were the inclusion criteria for the study? which t-test was used? paired OR INDEPENDENT ONE?

- Discussion: what are the study limitations? additionally, psychological aspects would influence the health. you can refer to the following references:
Irandoust, Khadijah et al. “Effect of Time-of-Day-Exercise in Group Settings on Level of Mood and Depression of Former Elite Male Athletes.” International journal of environmental research and public health vol. 16,19 3541. 22 Sep. 2019, doi:10.3390/ijerph16193541
- briefly describe and recommend them for future studies. the role of nutrition shouldn't be neglected. so put it as study limitations and recommend for further research
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 23 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. Topic is interesting but sample size is very low due to single center study. There is no new message in this report, but if the other reviewers think it could be accepted, I would not object and I recommend following correction before final decision.
1- ABSTRACT should be modified as Structured ABSTRACT.
2- Introduction: Please add some evidence about status of physical fitness among emergency care providers or other healthcare workers.
3- Methods: The other major problem is lack of control group. The lack of a control group is serious limitations of this study. Authors should be added a healthy controls group for better interpretation.
3- Result: Some data were repeated in the text and table. This part needs to be rewritten to avoid result repetition.
4- Conclusion should be revised based on the main findings of the study.
5- References are not enough up to date. Only one reference are recent article (from 2015 up to now) and some of them are related to before 2000. I suggest you consider more recent research and reference because 5 years is a huge period in science.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 23 Mar 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript was reviewed by our reviewers. The reviewers have raised concerns regarding the manuscript, and therefore, your paper is not acceptable for publication in this format. However since the reviewers do find some merit in the paper, I would be willing to reconsider if you wish to undertake major revisions and re-submit, addressing the referees' concerns.
Please note that resubmitting your manuscript does not guarantee acceptance and that your resubmission will be subject to a re-review before a decision is rendered.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 23 Mar 2020

Dear Authors,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Asian J Sports Med. Your manuscript has now been reviewed by two reviewers and an Associate Editor. I now have the reports of the

Referees, which suggest that your manuscript might be suitable for publication following a number of revisions. I attach some reviewer comments and invite you to submit a revised version of your manuscript addressing the points made.

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.

Corrections and response to reviewers' comments and suggestions

Dear Reviewers,

Thank you for your comments and suggestions. We believe that these will greatly improve the standard of the paper. Below, is a response to each of the reviewer comments. The revised paper is also attached with additions written in red.

Page/Section	Comment by reviewer	Correction by authors
Reviewer 1		
Abstract	ECPs should be written in full name and then abbreviation.	Thank you. This has been included.
Abstract	What was the rational for recruiting 90 subjects? Why too much difference in number of males and females?.	90 participants was adequate in the geographical area of the North West province in South Africa as there were only 127 in the population. An equal balance of gender was not emphasised in this study.
Abstract	*how about measuring other lipid profiles? if not possible, include in study limitations.*	Thank you. This has been included in the limitations section.
Abstract	*results and statistics should be reported in findings of abstract. report P values.*	Thank you. This has been reported and included.
Introduction	*better to focus more on the effects of Fat percent and WHR on health. since they can directly affect other parameters that you measured such as Blood pressure, soon*	Thank you. This has been implemented in the introduction. The references suggested has also been used and incorporated in the paper.
Methods	*what were the inclusion criteria for the study?*	This has been included.
Methods	*which t-test was used? paired OR INDEPENDENT ONE?*	A Student's t-test. This has been updated, thank you.
Discussion	*what are the study limitations? additionally, psychological aspects would influence the health*	Thank you. These have been included in the study limitations section.
Discussion	*briefly describe and recommend them for future studies. the role of nutrition shouldn't be neglected. so put it as study limitations and recommend for further research.*	Thank you. These have been indicated and included in the study limitations section. The references suggested has also been used and

		incorporated in the paper.
Page/Section	**Comment by reviewer**	**Correction by authors**
Reviewer 2		
Abstract	*1- ABSTRACT should be modified as Structured ABSTRACT.*	Thank you. The abstract has been modified as a structured abstract.
Introduction	*Please add some evidence about status of physical fitness among emergency care providers or other healthcare workers.*	Thank you. Evidence has been added and integrated in the introduction section.
Methods	*The other major problem is lack of control group. The lack of a control group is serious limitations of this study. Authors should be added a healthy controls group for better interpretation.*	Thank you. We have noted this in the study limitations section.
Results	*Some data were repeated in the text and table. This part needs to be rewritten to avoid result repetition.*	Thank you. This part has been rewritten.
Conclusion	*Conclusion should be revised based on the main findings of the study.*	The conclusion has been revised.
References	*References are not enough up to date. Only one reference are recent article (from 2015 up to now) and some of them are related to before 2000. I suggest you consider more recent research and reference because 5 years is a huge period in science.*	Thank you. We have tried our best to updated the references section with papers in the last five years. There is also a paucity of research conducted among ECPs in the context of health and fitness. Although some references may be more than 5 years old, it is still relevant to the context of the paper, and we have kept some.

Kindly note that we have also added norms used for each of the measurements, with references, in the methods section.

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) 16 Apr 2020

Dear EIC,
I reviewed the third revision of the article. All the requested changes were applied, and the paper was also upgraded in the whole sighting.
I have no more comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 16 Apr 2020

Dear Authors,
The second round of peer review of your manuscript has been completed, and I am pleased to inform you that your manuscript has now been accepted for publication in our journal.
Thanks.