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.103135
Published in: Asian Journal of Sports Medicine: 11(4); e103135

Peer Review Report for "The Effect of Two Types of High-Intensity Interval Training on Serum Value of GH and IGF-1 in Overweight Nurses"

Author(s): Sahar Avazpour , Jamal Fazell Kalkhoran, Karamat Avazpour, Fatemeh Mohseni

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 11 Apr 2020
Revised Date: 27 Jul 2020
Accepted Date: 14 Sep 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)

12 May 2020

Dear AE,
This study compared the effect of High intensity interval training on the level of IGF-1 and GH among female nurses. The topic of this study was of the interest. However, it seemed that the manuscript was not nicely written and requires major revisions, as bellow:
1. The authors should use the term HIIT instead of intermediate training in the manuscript title
2. The abstract needs to be improved as it were not written in the standard form. For example: the author should not write the baseline characteristics on the method section. The author should add the statistical result on the result section. Please define HIIT abbreviation on the abstract
3. The author should improve the flow of the introduction as it was quite hard to understand the background of this study. The author should also add references on the cited sentences/evidence. Objective should be written on the last paragraph of the study.
4. Method
It is crucial for the author to state the inclusion and exclusion criteria of the study

participants. For the ethical clearance, the author should also add the data on the method section. The authors have not list all of the measured variables including the baseline characteristics under the method section. The author should also state the measurement method of BMI, fat percentage etc in this study. For the statistical analysis, the author should write the statistical methodology in more details. For example is the p-value. What statistical software does the author used. What test did the author used in case if abnormally distribution data

5. Result

The author should add the p-value on the table 1 and the waist circumference measurement in addition to the WHR. The mean difference of the GH and IGF value between the groups should also be analyzed. The author should briefly write the statistical result/comparison between the group in the text.

6. Discussion

The authors have not elaborated the discussion part well. Firstly, the author should discuss briefly regarding the baseline characteristic of the study. The reason why the author choose women as the subjects, not men. Please also discuss the relationship between the subject profile (ans its several circumstances) with the study result. Secondly, the author should thoroughly discuss the clinical implication of the changes of the IGF-1 and the GH for clinical setting. Thirdly, the author should also discuss the implication of the intervention on weight, anthropometry and also fat percentage changes. Finally, The author should add the study limitation and recommendation

7. Lastly the most important issue is the English grammar and structure of this manuscript. The authors should improve this as it is quite difficult to understand the language written. I suggest to use professional translation agency or the one that was provided by the journal (if any)

Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 12 May 2020

Dear EIC,

As suggested by the reviewers the manuscript needs a major revision.

Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 13 May 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.

Reply to reviewers

Thank you for your valuable comments. All topics requested by both reviewers were corrected in the main file of the article and the topics were highlighted.

Yours sincerely

F. Mohseni

Reply to reviewer 1

The answers are highlighted in green in the "Full manuscript without authors" file.

1. The title of the article has been corrected.
2. The abbreviation)HIIT(is defined for the first time in the article title.
3. The main measured outcome in line 7 of the method section of the abstractwas added.
4. **"(mean age 25.81+60 yr, height 158.01+67 cm , and weight 69.41+25 kg)"**, deleted from method section of abstract.
5. **"The data were analyzed by the dependent t-test and ANOVA"**, moved to method section of the abstract.
6. Statistical results added in line 2 of the result section of the abstract.
7. The references were placed in line 5 of the background section.
8. The objective placed in the last paragraph of the introduction section.
9. The inclusion and exclusion criteria added in line 8 of the method section.
10. The reason for choosing women to study was explained in line 27 of the discussion section.
11. This is a quasi-experimental study and is not RCT. Ethical requirements for the study were explained in line 3 of the method section.
12. The recruitment flow chart placed on the methods section.
13. Yes, "homogenous groups" mean "matched" by BMI, weight etc (in line 5 of the Study Design part of method section).
14. The measurement method of BMI, fat percentage etc, explained in line 7 of Measurements part of the method section.
15. The hours of fasting explained in line 2 of Measurements part of the method section.
16. The statistical methodology explained in more details in line 2 of the statistical Analysis part of the method section.

17. The baseline characteristic of the subjects explained in line 1 of the results section.
18. The statistical result added in lines 6 and 8 of the results section.
19. Due to the fact that the groups were matched (homogenous groups) in terms of the baseline characteristics, the p-value has no value in this study.
20. The waist circumference measurement added in table 1.
21. The mean difference of the GH and IGF value added in table 2.
22. The requested items were described at the beginning and end of the discussion section.
23. The study limitation and recommendation added at the end of the discussion section.

Reply to reviewer 2

The answers are highlighted in yellow in the "Full manuscript without authors" file.

1. The title of the article has been corrected.
2. According to previous studies, the sample size was 27 people (line 1 of the method section of abstract).
3. **"(mean age 25.81+60 yr, height 158.01+67 cm , and weight 69.41+25 kg)"**, deleted from method section of abstract.
4. P values reported in line 2 of the result section of the abstract.
5. The recommended reference in line 3 of the background section was used.
6. Writing error in paragraph 5 line 2 of the background section corrected.
7. The final sentences of the background section were paraphrased.
8. The groups were described in the first line of the method section.
9. Sampling method added in the first line of study design section.
10. The average BMI of subjects in last line of study design section corrected.
11. The training protocol section was referenced.
12. P values reported in the result section.
13. Writing error in line 12 of the discussion section corrected.
14. The study limitation and recommendation added at the end of the discussion 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: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 29 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
I reviewed this paper comprehensively. However, I don't really agree with the creativity of this paper. Already, many papers similar to these titles have been published.
Thanks

Morteza Taheri: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 30 Aug 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** (1) — 13 Sep 2020

Dear EIC,
After this revision, I suggest that the paper could be accepted for publication.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 14 Sep 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