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

Asian Journal of Sports Medicine
Article DOI: 10.5812/asjsm.103000
Published in: Asian Journal of Sports Medicine: 11(4); e103000

Peer Review Report for "Do All Resistance Exercise Protocols Improve the Functional Parameters of the Elderly? A Review Study"

Author(s): Fabiano de Jesus Almeida, Maycon Henrique Melo, Raquel Nogueira, Jozimar Prazeres, Cyrene Costa, Bruno Bavaresco Gambassi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	26 Mar 2020
Revised Date:	16 Jul 2020
Accepted Date:	24 Jul 2020

Revision (0)

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

Seyed Houtan Shahidi: Reviewer | Revision (0) 2 Apr 2020

Dear AE,

This review, Effects of Different Resistance Training Protocols on Functional Parameters of the Elderly: A Critical Review. The primary study results indicated that RT improves the functional parameters of the elderly. This provides novel evidence that timing and modality of resistance exercise might improve the physical function of the elderly population. Although, several concerns limit this manuscript's quality and impact. Having said that, in my opinion, this article should not be considered to be published in the Asian Journal of Sports Medicine until several issues must be solved.

1. Language and style need improvement. A native speaker review is strongly recommending. Examples:

a. A critical in the title

b. Assessment in the abstract section

c. Eligibility in the method section

2. It would be better in the abstract and methods section, the breakdown of the number of men and women is suggested, as well as other demographic/anthropometric data.

3. In the Introduction, the authors describe that "a key study carried out by Liu and Latham (13) has found that RT is an effective intervention" I am not sure that this has been directly

studied, this study conduct on Progressive resistance strength training (PRT).
4. The introduction is poor. The author should describe better the physical function and related to aging and resistance exercise, and also the authors should better describe the definition of different resistance training.
5. I suggest that the methodology of selection study design demonstrated by figure.
6. It would be better in the result section having a Risk of bias section
7. In the discussion section, the authors describe that “For elderly individuals, due to their loss of fast twitch fibers, moderate to high-intensity training is recommended after an adaptation phase” Is there a reference for this?
8. The flow of the discussion makes it somewhat difficult to follow. I suggest providing definitions earlier in the introduction and reorganizing information so that it is logical and consistent in terms of topics being addressed.
9. This manuscript would greatly benefit from a limitations section where the authors could describe study limitations that may have affected the results and interpretation. Importantly, the authors might discuss how the present results can be interpreted about elderly exercise behavior, considering that habitual exercise behavior in the elderly populations.
10. It would be better, the author should write a good practical exercise application for elderly populations and involve a conclusion section.
11. The tables should rewrite in a better way and also it's better to include the sex of the participant.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 9 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
General comments:
• This article should be language edited by a first language English speaker.
• The background is very sparse. The background should justify the need for the review. It should also point out the importance of resistance training specifically for the elderly population.
• No mention is made of the tables in the text itself. Tables should be introduced in the test before using them.
Specific comments:
• Line 18: ‘assessmen’ should be ‘assessment’
• Line 19 ‘researches’ should be articles
• Line s21 and 22: It is not clear what this comment means – ‘with a tighter focus on the negative aspects observed in the studies investigated.’
• Line 45: ‘elegant’ this is an incorrect adjective for a scientific study
• Lines 48-50: This sentence is illegible – ‘Although there have been a number of studies on the association of RT and functional parameters has been deserved attention, the structural and functional consequences on the nervous and muscular systems justify the need for further studies on adequate strategies to attenuate aging damage’.
• Line 52: ‘the RT on elders' – Should read ‘RT on the elderly’s’.
• Line 90: ‘enrolled’ should be ‘consisted of’.
• Line 114: ‘There were no accidents with individuals during the protocol’ – this should rather read ‘There were no injuries reported related to the exercise programmes utilized in the 8

studies'.

• Lines 169-173: This sentence is not correctly placed and disrupts the flow of the argument. It should be deleted.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision (0)** 9 Apr 2020

Dear AE,

There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:

- Abstract conclusion: The abstract conclusion is too short and would suggest removing the sentence on the need for further studies and rather focus on the implications of the findings.
- Background: The background is brief and should be expanded to elucidate on the importance of the study.
- Background: It is also essential to describe what is meant by functional parameters or functional performance.
- Discussion: It is essential for the authors to discuss the limitations of the study such as the use of only 8 studies in a review.
- Discussion: The last line/conclusion is very weak and needs to be rewritten to demonstrate the importance and practicality of the study and not the future research needed.
- Table 1: There seems to be no order on how the authors were listed (i.e. alphabetically or quality of PEDro).
- The article needs to be language edited by a professional English editor.

Thanks.

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

Dear EIC,

The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.

Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 11 Apr 2020

Dear Author,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Asian J Sports Med. Your manuscript has now been reviewed by three 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.



EDITOR-IN-CHIEF: Prof. Vahid Ziaee, MD (Pediatric Rheumatology)
Sports Medicine Research Center, Neuroscience Institute, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran
Division of Pediatric Rheumatology, Children's Medical center, Pediatrics Center of Excellence, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

São Luís, Brazil, 19 May 2020

Thank you for your consideration of our manuscript, now entitled “Do all resistance exercise protocols improve functional parameters of the elderly? A review study”. We have reviewed the comments of the Reviewers and have thoroughly revised the manuscript. We hope that now our manuscript is suitable for publication in Asian Journal of Sports Medicine.

Dear Editor and Reviewers,

Thank you very much for your precious comments and suggestions. The comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper.
According to the comments and suggestions, we have revised the relevant part in the original manuscript. We also responded point-by-point to the comments of the reviewers as listed below, all changes are marked by yellow highlighting in the revised version of the manuscript.
Thank you very much for considering our manuscript for potential publication. I'm looking forward to hearing from you soon

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

This review, Effects of Different Resistance Training Protocols on Functional Parameters of the Elderly: A Critical Review. The primary study results indicated that RT improves the functional

parameters of the elderly. This provides novel evidence that timing and modality of resistance exercise might improve the physical function of the elderly population. Although, several concerns limit this manuscript's quality and impact. Having said that, in my opinion, this article should not be considered to be published in the Asian Journal of Sports Medicine until several issues must be solved.

1. Language and style need improvement. A native speaker review is strongly recommending. Examples:

a. a critical in the title

b. assessmen in the abstract section

c. Elegibility in the method section

We thank the reviewer for this suggestion, and the article was revised and edited by an English proficient proof-reader.

2. It would be better in the abstract and methods section, the breakdown of the number of men and women is suggested, as well as other demographic/anthropometric data.

Thanks for the suggestion, we made the change

3. In the Introduction, the authors describe that "a key study carried out by Liu and Latham (13) has found that RT is an effective intervention" I am not sure that this has been directly studied, this study conduct on Progressive resistance strength training (PRT).

Thanks for the suggestion, we made the change

4. The introduction is poor. The author should describe better the physical function and related to aging and resistance exercise, and also the authors should better describe the definition of different resistance training.

Thanks for the suggestion, we made the change

5. I suggest that the methodology of selection study design demonstrated by figure.

Thanks for the suggestion, we made the change.

6. It would be better in the result section having a Risk of bias section

We appreciate the suggestion, however we understand that there is no need in view of the exposure of the negative points, as well as the methodological quality of the research (PEDro Scale) in table 1.

7. In the discussion section, the authors describe that “For elderly individuals, due to their loss of fast twitch fibers, moderate to high intensity training is recommended after an adaptation phase” Is there a reference for this?

Thanks for the suggestion, we add reference

8. The flow of the discussion makes it somewhat difficult to follow. I suggest providing definitions earlier in the introduction and reorganizing information so that it is logical and consistent in terms of topics being addressed.

Thanks for the suggestion, we made the change

9. This manuscript would greatly benefit from a limitations section where the authors could describe study limitations that may have affected the results and interpretation. Importantly, the authors might discuss how the present results can be interpreted about elderly exercise behavior, considering that habitual exercise behavior in the elderly populations.

We appreciate the suggestion, but understand that there is no need for a limitations section in this review study.

10. It would be better, the author should write a good practical exercise application for elderly populations and involve a conclusion section.

We appreciate the suggestion, but we understand that it is not applied in the present study.

11. The tables should rewrite in a better way and also it's better to include the sex of the participant.

We appreciate the suggestion, we try to improve this part.

Reviewer 2:

General comments:

This article should be language edited by a first language English speaker.

We thank the reviewer for this suggestion, and the article was revised and edited by an English proficient proof-reader.

The background is very sparse. The background should justify the need for the review. It should also point out the importance of resistance training specifically for the elderly population.

Thanks for the suggestion, we made the change

No mention is made of the tables in the text itself. Tables should be introduced in the test before using them.

Thank you for the suggestion, the tables were mentioned in the result and discussion sections.

Specific comments:

• Line 18: ‘assessmen’ should be ‘assessment’

• Line 19 ‘researches’ should be articles

• Line s21 and 22: It is not clear what this comment means – ‘with a tighter focus on the negative aspects observed in the studies investigated.’

• Line 45: ‘elegant’ this is an incorrect adjective for a scientific study

• Lines 48-50: This sentence is illegible – ‘Although there have been a number of studies on the association of RT and functional parameters has been deserved attention, the structural and functional consequences on the nervous and muscular systems justify the need for further studies on adequate strategies to attenuate aging damage’.

• Line 52: ‘the RT on elders' – Should read ‘RT on the elderly’s’.

• Line 90: ‘enrolled’ should be ‘consisted of’.

• Line 114: ‘There were no accidents with individuals during the protocol’ – this should rather read ‘There were no injuries reported related to the exercise programmes utilized in the 8 studies’.

• Lines 169-173: This sentence is not correctly placed and disrupts the flow of the argument. It should be deleted.

Thanks for the suggestion, we made the change

Reviewer 3:

Abstract conclusion: The abstract conclusion is too short and would suggest removing the sentence on the need for further studies and rather focus on the implications of the findings.

Thanks for the suggestion, we made the change

Background:The background is brief and should be expanded to elucidate on the importance of the study.

Thanks for the suggestion, we made the change

Background: It is also essential to describe what is meant by functional parameters or functional performance.

Thanks for the suggestion, we made the change

Discussion: It is essential for the authors to discuss the limitations of the study such as the use of only 8 studies in a review.

We appreciate the suggestion, but we understand that it is not applied in the present study. Eight studies were selected because only these met the inclusion criteria for this research. This was because we sought only randomized clinical trials involving resistance training and parameters (e.g. timed-up-and-go, gait speed, getting out of a chair) of the elderly.

Discussion: The last line/conclusion is very weak and needs to be rewritten to demonstrate the importance and practicality of the study and not the future research needed.

Thanks for the suggestion, we made the change

Table 1: There seems to be no order on how the authors were listed (i.e. alphabetically or quality of PEDro).

Thanks for the suggestion, we made the change

The article needs to be language edited by a professional English editor.

We thank the reviewer for this suggestion, and the article was revised and edited by an English proficient proof-reader.

With kind regards,



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) 15 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
Good revision.
Just a few minor editing suggestions, I would recommend including the effect of different responses RT on the elderly female and male individually, as in the literate the author includes both female and male, it would be helpful if the author adds the various feedback of sex.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 7 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks for resubmitting the article in the Asian Journal of Sports Medicine. The revisions you made are rational and acceptable; however, there are still some issues to resolve in order to improve this manuscript for publication. These minor revisions are needed:
1. Please avoid typos as the second 'we' in lines 9 and 133: We cannot safely state.
2. The Introduction and discussion still needed to be enhanced. It's noteworthy to briefly compare RT with other exercise therapies as cardio exercises like treadmill training effects on the functional capacity and wellness of elderly populations. Here is a recent, convenient peer-reviewed article, you can use as a reference:
• Arfa-Fatollahkhani P, Cherati AS, Habibi SA, Shahidi GA, Sohrabi A, Zamani B. Effects of treadmill training on the balance, functional capacity and quality of life in Parkinson's disease: A randomized clinical trial. Journal of Complementary and Integrative Medicine. 2019 Aug 21;17(1).
3. It is better to replace the definition of RT from the third paragraph of the introduction with the second paragraph. It is necessary to first define the RT and then go through the details of previous RT studies.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 8 Jul 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (1)** 10 Jul 2020

Dear Author,

The authors have addressed the majority of my concerns. I just have some reviewers' comments which are in the attached file. Please consider these suggestions in revising your paper.

Thanks

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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.



EDITOR-IN-CHIEF: Prof. Vahid Ziaee, MD (Pediatric Rheumatology)
Sports Medicine Research Center, Neuroscience Institute, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran
Division of Pediatric Rheumatology, Children's Medical center, Pediatrics Center of Excellence, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

São Luís, Brazil, 10 July 2020

Thank you for your consideration of our manuscript, now entitled “Do all resistance exercise protocols improve functional parameters of the elderly? A review study”. We have reviewed the comments of the Reviewers and have thoroughly revised the manuscript. We hope that now our manuscript is suitable for publication in Asian Journal of Sports Medicine.

Dear Editor and Reviewers,

Thank you very much for your precious comments and suggestions. We responded point-by-point to the comments of the reviewers as listed below, all changes are marked by yellow highlighting in the revised version of the manuscript.
Thank you very much for considering our manuscript for potential publication. I'm looking forward to hearing from you soon

Reviewers' Comments:
Reviewer 1:
I would recommend including the effect of different responses RT on the elderly female and male individually, as in the literate the author includes both female and male, it would be helpful if the author adds the various feedback of sex.

We thank the reviewer for this suggestion, but the manuscripts selected for this review do not present the findings by gender. Another point, the highlights of the study was to assess the effects of Resistance Training on functional parameters (e.g. timed-up-and-go, gait speed, getting out of a chair) among elderly people and undertake a detailed analysis of the exercise protocols surveyed.

Reviewer 2:

1. Please avoid typos as the second 'we' in lines 9 and 133: We cannot we safely state.

Thanks for the suggestion, we made the change

2. The Introduction and discussion still needed to be enhanced. It's noteworthy to briefly compare RT with other exercise therapies as cardio exercises like treadmill training effects on the functional capacity and wellness of elderly populations. Here is a recent, convenient peer-reviewed article, you can use as a reference:

• Arfa-Fatollahkhani P, Cherati AS, Habibi SA, Shahidi GA, Sohrabi A, Zamani B. Effects of treadmill training on the balance, functional capacity and quality of life in Parkinson's disease: A randomized clinical trial. Journal of Complementary and Integrative Medicine. 2019 Aug 21;17(1).

We thank the reviewer for this suggestion. We consider the reference important for the introduction but do not understand that we should discuss RT with other exercise therapies as cardio exercises like treadmill training effects on the functional capacity and wellness of elderly populations. The highlights of the study was to assess the effects of Resistance Training on functional parameters (e.g. timed-up-and-go, gait speed, getting out of a chair) among elderly people and undertake a detailed analysis of the exercise protocols surveyed.

3. It is better to replace the definition of RT from the third paragraph of the introduction with the second paragraph. It is necessary to first define the RT and then go through the details of previous RT studies.

Thanks for the suggestion, we made the change

With kind regards,



OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 18 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks for resubmitting the manuscript in Asian Journal of Sports Medicine. The answers and revisions are rational. Hence, the recent format of the manuscript seems acceptable to be published in Asian Journal of Sports Medicine.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 20 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 24 Jul 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 24 Jul 2020

Dear Author,
The third 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.