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.106588
Published in: Asian Journal of Sports Medicine: 12(1); e106588

Peer Review Report for "Resistance Training as a Countermeasure for Key Non-communicable Diseases in Low-Resource Settings: A Review"

Author(s): Brandon Stuwart Shaw, Ina Shaw

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	24 Jun 2020
Revised Date:	11 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.

L Maqina: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 20 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
The paper was professionally written, a grammar check was performed, and the author used the correct grammar. This was a review study; the search was executed correctly with a sufficient timeline. The keyword search was well defined. The search was standardized and can be traced back to the original reviewed articles which have yielded a good reliability factor for the study.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 23 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
Resistance training as a countermeasure for key non-communicable diseases in low-resource settings: a review
This manuscript is a review designed to examine low-cost approaches of resistance training to health promotion, NCD risk reduction, and NCD rehabilitation/management to mitigate the epidemic of NCDs in lower-resource settings.

Minor Comments:

1. Line 55: Delete ‘fortunately’ I suggest the sentence should read: ‘The role of exercise in major NCDs is evident; however, popular and cost-effective aerobic…’
2. Line 57: Delete ‘Thankfully’ and replace it with ‘Interestingly’.
3. Line 109: ‘NCDs’ should be NCDs
4. Line 195-196: ‘to the lavish’ This phrase is not clear.

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 minor 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.

Resistance training as a countermeasure for key non-communicable diseases in low-resource settings: a review

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

1. Line 55: Delete ‘fortunately’ I suggest the sentence should read: ‘The role of exercise in major NCDs is evident; however, popular and cost-effective aerobic…’

Deleted

2. Line 57: Delete ‘Thankfully’ and replace it with ‘Interestingly’.

Corrected

3. Line 109: ‘NCDS’ should be NCDs

Corrected

4. Line 195-196: ‘to the lavish’ This phrase is not clear.

Clarified

Reviewer 2:

The paper was professionally written, a grammar check was performed, and the author used the correct grammar. This was a review study; the search was executed correctly with sufficient timeline. The keyword search was well defined. The search was standardised and can be traced back to the original reviewed articles which has yielded a good reliability factor for the study.

Much appreciated

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 comments raised by me. The paper is acceptable to me.
Thanks

Oleksandr Krasilshchikov: 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.
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