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.106589
Published in: Asian Journal of Sports Medicine: 12(2); e106589

Peer Review Report for "Comparison of Muscular Endurance and Hypertrophy Resistance Training on Cardiovascular Disease Risk in Sedentary Male Smokers"

Author(s): Brandon Stuwart Shaw, Stacey Turner, Ina Shaw

Review Timeline:

- Submit Date: 17 Jun 2020
- Revised Date: 29 Sep 2020
- Accepted Date: 30 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,
Comparison of Muscular Endurance and Hypertrophy Resistance Training on Cardiovascular Disease Risk in Smokers
General comments
This study evaluate the effects of hypertrophy and muscular endurance RT on cardiovascular disease (CVD) risk in sedentary males. Cardiovascular is a public health problem causing considerable morbidity and mortality in both developed and developing countries. Understanding the different benefits of resistance training (RT) subtypes among health professionals will inform CVD risk reduction interventions. The manuscript add to the body of knowledge in this context.
Minor comments:
1. The title should reflect the population studied-smokers or sedentary males?
2. Line 106: Change ‘To this point” to ‘In this context’.
3. Line 111: I suggest you delete ‘attempted to’ in the sentence.

4. Line 120: Delete the ‘and’ between sedentary and weight
5. Line 120: Delete ‘to be’ in the sentence before ‘current’.
6. Line 201: Rephrase the sentence starting with ‘This study novely….The word ‘novely’ is not appropriate. Simply state that ‘The novelty of this finding….
7. Line 222: “This study similarly only found…” Rephrase this
Thnaks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (**0**)** 21 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**)** 23 Sep 2020

Dear Authors,
Your manuscript was reviewed by our reviewers. As initial decision, your manuscript was found interesting but some revisions have to be made before it can reach a publishable value.
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.

Comments to reviewers

Comparison of Muscular Endurance and Hypertrophy Resistance Training on Cardiovascular Disease Risk in Smokers

1. The title should reflect the population studied-smokers or sedentary males?

Title amended

2. Line 106: Change 'To this point" to 'In this context'.

Amended in section 1.

3. Line 111: I suggest you delete 'attempted to' in the sentence.

Deleted in section 2.

4. Line 120: Delete the 'and' between sedentary and weight

Deleted in section 3.

5. Line 120: Delete 'to be' in the sentence before 'current'.

Deleted in section 3.

6. Line 201: Rephrase the sentence starting with 'This study novely….The word 'novely' is not appropriate. Simply state that 'The novelty of this finding….

Amended in section 5.

7. Line 222: "This study similarly only found…" Rephrase this

Rephrased in section 5.

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 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
The comments are attended to by the authors. The manuscript can be accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 30 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) 30 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