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.106562
Published in: Asian Journal of Sports Medicine: 12(1); e106562

Peer Review Report for "Reductions in Cardiopulmonary Disease Risk Following Calisthenic Concurrent Aerobic and Resistance Training in Young Adults in a Low Resource Setting"

Author(s): Ina Shaw, Stacey Turner, Christy McCrorie, Ashleigh Schnetler, Brandon Stuwart Shaw

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	23 Jun 2020
Revised Date:	10 Sep 2020
Accepted Date:	1 Oct 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)

23 Aug 2020

Dear AE,

Reductions in cardiopulmonary disease risk following callisthenic concurrent aerobic and resistance training in young adults in a low resource setting

Overweight and obesity is a world-wide growing global public health problem; and overweight and obesity in young adults and its consequences track to adulthood. Therefore, measures to prevent overweight and obesity are crucial as well as measures to manage its consequences in populations is desirable.

The authors seek to determine if callisthenic concurrent aerobic and resistance training could reduce cardiopulmonary disease risk in young adults in a low resource setting. However, the connection of overweight and obesity to the title is not explicit.

1. What do the authors mean by 'Low resource setting'? And where?

2. Line 52: 'Problematically, formalized exercise treatments are not readily available in low-

and middle-income countries.' This sentence seems vague. It does not relate to anything. Complete the sentence.
3. Line 54: Delete 'attempted to' in the objective.
4. Briefly state the anthropometric or body composition indicators in the abstract.
5. Mention the outcome measure in the methodology
6. Line 102-104: Judging from the aim of the title of the study and the aim, the connection with overweight and obesity is seemingly unclear. The problem statement is confusing- "it is unclear whether resistance training can unequivocally improve pulmonary function (15, 16). Further, little/no recommendations exist on how exercise for health promotion or primary prevention could be delivered in low-resource settings (17)."
7. Line 117: Delete 'attempted' in the sentence.
8. Line 135: State the name of the Ethics Review Board
9. Line 234: Spelling mistake-'occures' should be 'occurs'
Thanks

L Maqina: Reviewer | **Revision (0)** 24 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
The article is well set out, the author has used well documented methods and the research would be replicated, although one might want improve on the sample size. Because still the is not enough backed papers on this topic thus an increased sample size would void this space. The study can be better improved stating the Lung function test protocol used because the is a big gap in literature available on such protocols for children.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 2 Sep 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)** 4 Sep 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.

Reductions in cardiopulmonary disease risk following callisthenic concurrent aerobic and resistance training in young adults in a low resource setting

Comments to reviewers

Reviewer 1

1. What do the authors mean by ‘Low resource setting’? And where?

Added to 3.1.

2. Line 52: ‘Problematically, formalized exercise treatments are not readily available in low- and middle-income countries.’ This sentence seems vague. It does not relate to anything. Complete the sentence.

Sentence removed from abstract background.

3. Line 54: Delete ‘attempted to’ in the objective.

Deleted

4. Briefly state the anthropometric or body composition indicators in the abstract.

Included

5. Mention the outcome measure in the methodology

Included

6. Line 102-104: Judging from the aim of the title of the study and the aim, the connection with overweight and obesity is seemingly unclear. The problem statement is confusing- “it is unclear whether resistance training can unequivocally improve pulmonary function (15, 16). Further, little/no recommendations exist on how exercise for health promotion or primary prevention could be delivered in low-resource settings (17).”

Connection between overweight, pulmonary function and aim clarified

7. Line 117: Delete ‘attempted’ in the sentence.

Deleted

8. Line 135: State the name of the Ethics Review Board

Included

9. Line 234: Spelling mistake-‘occures’ should be ‘occurs’

Corrected

Reviewer 2

The article is well set out, the author has used well documented methods and the research would be replicated, although one might want improve on the sample size. Because still the is not enough backed papers on this topic thus an increased sample size would void this space. The study can be better improved stating the Lung function test protocol used because the is a big gap in literature available on such protocols for children.

Limitation of small sample size included
Spirometry protocol used included

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 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
The authors have addressed all the minor comments and corrections raised by me.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 1 Oct 2020

Dear EIC,
I have received the feedback from the reviewers and they are satisfied with the changes requested.
However, the final outcome of the decision to publish or not will be conveyed to you by the editorial board.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 1 Oct 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