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.106591
Published in: Asian Journal of Sports Medicine: 12(1); e106591

Peer Review Report for "Efficacy of Home-Based Callisthenic Resistance Training on Cardiovascular Disease Risk in Overweight Compared to Normal Weight Preadolescents"

Author(s): Ina Shaw, Victoria E Boshoff, Sunette Coetzee, Brandon Stuwart Shaw

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 24 Jun 2020
Revised Date: 11 Sep 2020
Accepted Date: 23 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.

L Maqina: Reviewer | **Revision (0)** 3 Aug 2020

Dear AE,

Efficacy of home-based callisthenic resistance training on cardiovascular disease risk in overweight compared to normal weight preadolescents

1. What was the purpose of the article?

The primary intention of the present study was to evaluate and contrast the effectiveness of callisthenic resistance training performed at home on CVD risk in overweight compared to normal weight preadolescents. This study resulted in improvements in hip circumference, sum of skinfolds in the normal weight children. In turn, improvements were found in body mass, BMI, BF%, FM, sum of skinfolds, and cardiorespiratory endurance in the sampled overweight/obese children.

2. Is the journal appropriate for the paper and briefly evaluate the journal

Yes, the journal is appropriate for the paper with a very reputable rating factor.

3. Is the article well set out?

Yes, the article is well set out, the author has used well documented methods and the

research would be replicable, 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.
4. What kind of research design was used?
Experimental design, the study was executed correctly but the author could have further elaborated on how the study techniques were standardised such as the body fat and blood pressure measurement
5. Plagiarism detection in the manuscript?
The paper was submitted to turn-it-in application for a plagiarism report and the paper came back with minimal plagiarism.
6. Did you pick up any bias?
Fairly, the sample size was evenly distributed between the two groups. The author could have also stated on how the randomisation was done to give an idea of how many children had an opportunity of being selected to be part of the study.
7. Analysis method of the manuscript
The analysis methods used in the study were well documented and can be repeatable in a similar study. The correct T-test was used to compare inter-group inferential statistics to determine if there is a significant difference between the means of the two groups, which may be related in certain features.
8. Results
The results were well documented on the tables with all the required level of significance (p-values). The results also showed a level of significance in the intervention programme as the was a level of significance in the pre and post testing results.
9. What comments do you have on the referencing and citations?
The author has used the correct referencing method as required by the journal. The author has referenced the paper quite well using credited source. The research has also used recent sources. The author has also made a few mistakes by using a journal of 1987 as a reference as it would be difficult in other places to track such sources as such journal might be difficult to find and require extensive budget thus the author could look for most recent papers.
10. What comments do you have on the English writing?
The paper was professionally written, a grammar check was performed, and the author used the correct grammar. The author can improve in using intext numbering by being consistent either using the numerical numbering system or wording system. The author also can improve in using the consistent word in these instant children and preadolescent the words are used in the text and topic of the study differently which can be confusing for the reader.
11. Your decision about this manuscript (accept/revision/reject).
Accept
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 2 Sep 2020

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.

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.

Efficacy of home-based callisthenic resistance training on cardiovascular disease risk in overweight compared to normal weight preadolescents

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

1. Missing word (Preadolescents)

   Added to Abstract objectives

2. Consistency in numbering either use words or units

   Cross-checked for consistency

3. Consistency either use children or Preadolescent (write out preadolescents in the same way throughout)

   Adjusted throughout with children

4. Missing word state the population affected by obesity to avoid being vague (either state children or general population)

   Global population refers to adults and children

Reviewer 2:

1. Remove treatment and put preventative measures, such physical activity interventions are not put in place as prescribed by WHO.

   Corrected in background of abstract

2. Missing what method of research was done, please indicate.

   Included in methods of abstract

3. Remove the statement with: The study showed that home-based callisthenics's resistance training is a cost-effective and useful intervention strategy to decrease CVD risk in overweight/obese children, but has limited effect in normal weight preadolescence.

   Removed

4. Data analysis was done using SPPS-25.

   Adjusted in statistical analysis

5. Remove primary interntion and replace with The primary objective of the study was to evaluate and contrast the effectiveness of callisthenic resistance training performed at home on CVD risk in overweight compared to normal weight preadolescents.

   Adjusted in discussion

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.

L Maqina: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 17 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
All requested correction were duly noted and deemed satisfactory.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 18 Sep 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) 21 Sep 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) 23 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