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.106593
Published in: Asian Journal of Sports Medicine: 12(1); e106593

Peer Review Report for "Group-Based Exercise as a Therapeutic Strategy for the Improvement of Mental Outcomes in Mild to Moderate Alzheimer's Patients in Low Resource Care Facilities"

Author(s): Ina Shaw, Melany Cronje, Brandon Stuwart Shaw

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	20 Jun 2020
Revised Date:	6 Oct 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) 20 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
Abstract
1. Remove the word since and only start with exercise.
2. suggest the sentence to read as follows: This study determined the effect of low-cost group- based exercise on mental outcomes in patients with mild to moderate AD.
3. suggest your rewrite the statement as follows: The intervention program showed a significant increase in Mini-Mental.....
Introduction.
1. Please provide Citation to support the statement in line 79-80.
2. suggest to remove the word attempt and revise as follows: This study aimed to determine the effect of low-cost, group-based exercise on mental outcomes in patients with mild to moderate AD in line number 119.
3. What was the setting of the AD care facilities. In line 125.

4. remove attempt in line number 219, with the word aimed.
5. relevant Institutional Review Boards (REC-
01-247-2015). Participants and/or legal guardians were informed about the characteristics.
specify which institution in line number 288.
Thanks

Lynn Smith: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 1 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
Plagiarism detection in the manuscript:
- Possible plagiarism detected from the middle of line 103 to the end of line 108. Please cite the work/text accordingly.
- Possible plagiarism detected from line 110 to line 113. Please cite the work/text accordingly.
Methods section:
- Information on the scoring of the ADCS-ADL and QOL-AD questionnaires will be helpful, as was reported for the MMSE.
- Please indicate if the ADCS-ADL was done in questionnaire format, or if the researcher interviewed the patient, as the scale can be administered either method.
- It is clear that the participants were evaluated prior to commencement of the training programme, however, I am uncertain as to whether the program prescription was based on the individual assessment results, or if a generic program was issued.
- At the fourth-week interval, was the programme progressed if adaptations took place, or did the participant continue to perform the same exercises throughout the 12-week period?
Analysis method of the manuscript:
- Nothing to comment on.
Results and discussion:
- Although the within-group pre-, mid-, and post-test results on the QOL-AD were not found to be significant, it might still be worth discussing since the means have been included in table 2 and mentioned briefly in the results section.
Correct referencing and citations:
- Include DOI for reference 4, 14, 20, 21 and 22, if available, to ensure consistency.
Correct and proper English writing:
- In line 91, the word ‘an’ before increase, should be removed.
- In line 107, remove the second ‘obvious’ in this line.
- Well-written manuscript with interesting findings.
Thanks

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

Dear Authors,

The reviewers and editors were very interested in your work, which they found timely and important. They however had a few minor concerns regarding your manuscript, as detailed in their attached reviews.

Addressing these concerns will require a minor revision of your manuscript before it can be reconsidered for publication in the Journal. If you are willing to revise your manuscript in accordance with these comments, we will be happy to reconsider it.

When preparing your revised manuscript, you must carefully consider the reviewers' comments, and submit a "point by point" reply to all of them. You should also show in red the changes made in the body of the revised manuscript. Your reply should be uploaded as a file in addition to your revised manuscript.

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

Group-Based Exercise as a Therapeutic Strategy for the Improvement of Mental Outcomes in Mild to Moderate Alzheimer's Patients in Low Resource Care Facilities

---

REVIEWER 1:

Possible plagiarism detected from the middle of line 103 to the end of line 108. Please cite the work/text accordingly.

Reference added in lines 105, 107 and 109 of section 1.

Possible plagiarism detected from line 110 to line 113. Please cite the work/text accordingly.

Reference added in lines 113 of section 1.

Information on scoring of the ADCS-ADL and QOL-AD questionnaires will be helpful, as was reported on for the MMSE.

More information provided in section 3.2 under ADCS-ADL and QOL-AD.

Please indicate if the ADCS-ADL was done in questionnaire format, or if the researcher interviewed the patient, as the scale can be administered either method.

Indicated in section 3.2 under ADCS-ADL.

It is clear that the participants were evaluated prior to commencement of the training programme, however, I am uncertain as to whether the programme prescription was based on the individual assessment results, or if a generic programme was issued.

Indicated in section 3.3.

At the fourth-week interval, was the programme progressed if adaptations took place, or did the participant continue to perform the same exercises throughout the 12-week period?

Indicated at lines 184-186.

Although the within-group pre-, mid- and post-test results on the QOL-AD was not found to be significant, it might still be worth discussing since the means have been included in table 2 and mentioned briefly in the results section.

Included in section 5 – last paragraph.

Include DOI for reference 4, 14, 20, 21 and 22, if available, to ensure consistency.

These references do not have DOI's.

In line 91, the word 'an' before increase, should be removed.

Deleted on line 91

In line 107, remove the second 'obvious' in this line.

Deleted on line 107

REVIEWER 2:

Abstract: Remove the word since and only start with exercise.

Deleted

Abstract: Suggest the sentence to read as follows: This study determined the effect of low-cost group- based exercise on mental outcomes in patients with mild to moderate AD.

Amended accordingly in abstract objectives

Abstract: Suggest your rewrite the statement as follows: The intervention program showed a significant increase in Mini-Mental.....

Amended accordingly in abstract results

Introduction: Please provide Citation to support the statement in line 79-80.

Reference added

Suggest to remove the word attempt and revise as follows: This study aimed to determine the effect of low-cost, group-based exercise on mental outcomes in patients with mild to moderate AD in line number 119.

Amended accordingly in section 2

What was the setting of the AD care facilities. In line 125.

Added in section 3.1

Remove attempt in line number 219, with the word aimed.

Amended accordingly in section 5 line 225

Relevant Institutional Review Boards (REC-01-247-2015). Participants and/or legal guardians were informed about the characteristics. specify which institution in line number 288.

Included in section 3.1 and at footnotes

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.

Lynn Smith: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 27 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 29 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
Thank you for the opportunity to review the article. I am satisfied with the changes the authors made to the new submission, no further comment the paper can be accepted for publication.
kind regards

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