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.106598
Published in: Asian Journal of Sports Medicine: 12(2); e106598

Peer Review Report for "Combined Aerobic and Resistance Training Lowers Body Fat Percentage in Rural Black South African Women"

Author(s): Samuel Ntshaba, Mbali Mhlongo, Henrico Erasmus, Ina Shaw, Brandon Stuwart Shaw

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 20 Jun 2020
Revised Date: 30 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.

Y Paul: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 2 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
A good study done in impoverished communities.
Thanks

Tshidi Thaane: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 9 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
Journal Name: Asian Journal of Sports Medicine
Manuscript title: Cardiovascular disease risk reduction using concurrent aerobic and resistance training in rural black college women
Manuscript ID: 106598
Date: 20 August 2020
Your Total Score for is: (min: 0, max: 20) 15
****
Please write your comments according to these points:

Title

1) Proper Article TITLE?

I think the title is not appropriate. My suggestion: Combined aerobic and resistance training lowers body fat percentage in black South African women

2) Does the title reflect the content appropriately?

The title does not fully reflect the content.

3) Is there any abbreviation in the TITLE?

There is no abbreviation in the title.

4) Importance and originality or the subject? (Is the information, or the interpretation of the information, new?)

The study investigated the effects of combined exercise modes in females. The study findings are very important and original.

5) Proper Authors' names and institutional affiliations?

Author name and institutional affiliations not provided.

6) Source(s) of support in the form of grants, equipment, drugs, or all of these

This has been addressed under: Funding/Support: No funding or support has been received for this study.

Abstract

7) Is there structured ABSTRACT?

Yes

8) How many words are there in the ABSTRACT (Count = 250-350)?

Word count in the abstract is 294

9) Accurateness and adequacy of the ABSTRACT? (Does the abstract describe the content accurately?)

Yes

10) Are KEYWORDS (3-10) selected from MESH (http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/MBrowser.html)?

Yes

Introduction

11) Clarity of the objectives/hypotheses? (Are the objectives clearly stated?)

The authors did not provide study objectives. Instead, the aim of the study has been presented as the study objectives instead of the primary aim. I would suggest a section outline specific objectives of the study.

12) Does INTRODUCTION include: "What we know", "What we don't know" and "Aims"?

The introduction includes 'what we know' and 'what we don't know but no study aim.

Materials And Methods

13) Clearly describe selection of participants (patients or laboratory animals, including controls)?

Selection of participants has been described clearly including the control group.

14) Study Design Described Sufficiently?

Study design has not been described fully.

15) Adequacy of the sample studied?

Adequacy of study sample has not been described.

16) Subjects Representative of Target Population?

Study participants do represent the target population.

17) Provided sample size calculation or justification?

Authors did not describe the sample size calculation nor provide justification.

18) Control Subjects Appropriate?

Yes

19) Power of study declared?

No

20) Reported actual P values for primary analyses?

Actual P values have been reported in Table 1.

21) Blinding of Investigators (if possible)?

The blinding of investigators was not reported.

22) Blinding of subjects (if possible)?

The blinding of subjects was not reported.

23) Identify the methods, and apparatus (give the manufacturer's name and address in parentheses)?

Authors have not adequately described the apparatus or tools used in the study.

24) Identify procedures in sufficient detail to allow other workers to reproduce the results?

No

25) Give references to established methods and brief descriptions for methods that have been published but are not well known?

Authors have provided brief descriptions of methods and provided references.

26) Describe new or substantially modified methods, give reasons for using them, and evaluate their limitations?

Authors have not reported new or substantially modified methods.

27) Identify precisely all drugs and chemicals used, including generic name(s), dose(s), and route(s) of administration?

Not applicable.

28) Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria Explained?

The inclusion/Exclusion criteria have been explained.

29) Appropriate Statistical Analysis?

Yes

30) Identified all statistical methods unambiguously?

Statistical methods are ambiguous.

31) Explain Ethical Considerations?

Authors have simply stated 'Ethical clearance was obtained' no other information of ethical considerations is provided.

Review Articles

32) Authors submitting review manuscripts should include a section describing the methods used for locating, selecting, extracting, and synthesizing data?

Case Report

33) Proper writing of principles and elements of Medical History?

34) Indicating of Paraclinic examination?

35) Is there any Image, figures and tables for Case presentation?

36) Consideration of medical ethics for case presentation? (Are there any special ethical concerns arising from the use of human or other animal subjects?)

Results

37) Accuracy of the interpretation of RESULTS?

Authors interpreted results correctly.

38) RESULTS recorded appropriately?

Results were recorded appropriately

39) Appropriateness, clarity, and adequacy of the TABLES AND FIGURES?

Table 1 is clear. Suggest removal of horizontal lines.

40) Present results in logical sequence in the text, tables, and illustrations, giving the main or most important findings?

Authors reported results in logical sequence. Main findings provided.

41) Repeat the data in the tables and Text?

Data provided in the text repeated in table 1.

42) Emphasize or summarize only important observations?

Important observations have been summarized.

43) Any Appendix for extra or supplementary materials and technical detail?

No appendix provided.

44) Restrict tables and figures to those needed to explain the argument of the paper and to assess its support?

Tables restricted to explain the argument of the paper.

45) Use graphs as an alternative to tables with many entries?

No graphs presented.

46) Duplicate data in graphs and tables?

One table provided. No graphs were presented.

47) Use technical terms as non-technical in statistics, such as “random” (which implies a randomizing device), “normal,” “significant,” “correlations,” and “sample.”?

Technical terms have been used.

Discussion

48) Relevance of the DISCUSSION section?

Discussion is relevant.

49) CONCLUSIONS justified & substantiated?

Authors have justified and substantiated the conclusions.

50) What CONCLUSIONS would you draw from these results?

Exercise should be prescribed based on the primary goal i.e. Combined aerobic and resistance training should be prescribed for young black women when the primary goal is fat loss.

51) Analysis supports CONCLUSIONS?

Yes

52) Are the conclusions supported by the discussion?

Yes.

References

53) Appropriateness of the REFERENCES?

Appropriate references used.

54) Proper Writing of the REFERENCES?

Proper references provided.

55) References for the last 5 years?

Majority of references older than 5 years.

56) Which type of writing is observed for references (Vancouver, Harward, Oxford, etc)?

Vancouver.

57) Indicate references in parentheses?

Yes.

General Review

58) Proper Style for Medical Writing?

Yes

59) Define unique terms and acronyms the first time used?

Yes

60) Proper English Grammar and Writing?

Acceptable

61) Which sections are too long?

No section is too long.

62) Which sections are too short?

Results and discussion

63) Which sections of this manuscript could be misunderstood?

There is no section that could be misunderstood.

64) Describe the three major weaknesses of this paper:

1. Objectives

Authors could perhaps consider adding section “Aim” (which is currently listed as the objectives), and perhaps have standalone section listing specific objectives.

2. Methods

Materials and methods are missing a lot of detail. I suggest the addition of recruitment strategies, and a flow chart showing number of participants enrolled, included/excluded, and lost to follow-up. Where was the study conducted (i.e. in a lab, sports field). Why the 6-minute walk test? Is it the best measure of aerobic fitness in 18-25-year-old females?

3. Discussion

This is a very important study on young females. Authors could consider expanding on the discussion to really highlight the important findings and bring attention to the scant scientific research on women in South Africa.

4. Limitations

Authors indicated the study is cross-sectional which I think is incorrect. The authors could consider adding that 1) no dietary information was collected (was the COM eating the same as the control group). Menstrual cycle logs (as this can obscure primary variables including body percentage and aerobic fitness).

65) What additional information would you need to reproduce this study?

1. Methods used to recruit study participants. Were incentives given?

2. What was the total duration of the study (from ethical approval to last day of data collection)?

3. How many participants were enrolled into the study and how many were excluded and what were the reasons (contraindications to exercise).

4. What percentage (if any) was lost to follow up.

5. Were exercise sessions supervised?

66) Your Final Conclusion is: Approve, Minor Revision, Major Revision, Decline

Minor revision

References

1) Feurer, ID et al. (1994) Evaluating Peer Reviews. Pilot testing of a Grading Instrument. JAMA, 272, (2) 98-100.

2) Cho, M K & Bero L. A (1994) Instruments for Assessing the Qauality of Drug Studies

Published in the Medical Literature JAMA, 272, (2) 101-104.
3) http://www.priory.com/peer.htm
4) http://www.icmje.org/#author
5) Davidoff F for the CSE Task Force on Authorship. . Who's the Author? Problems with Biomedical Authorship, and Some Possible Solutions. Science Editor. 2000 Jul-Aug;23 (4):111-9.
6) Yank V, Rennie D. Disclosure of researcher contributions: a study of original research articles in The Lancet. Ann Intern Med. 1999 Apr 20;130(8):661-70.
7) Flanagin A, Fontanarosa PB, DeAngelis CD. Authorship for research groups. JAMA. 2002;288:3166-8.
8) F Godlee, T Jefferson. Peer Review in Health Sciences. London: BMJ Books, 1999.
9) World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki: ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects. JAMA. 2000 Dec 20;284(23):3043-5.
10) Pitkin RM, Branagan MA, Burmeister LF. Accuracy of data in abstracts of published research articles. JAMA. 1999 Mar 24-31;281(12):1110-1.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 9 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) 9 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.
Regards

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

Combined aerobic and resistance training lowers body fat percentage in rural black South African women

Reviewer 1:

Good study done in impoverished communities

Thank you for the enriching comment.

Reviewer 2:

I think the tittle is not appropriate. My suggestion: Combined aerobic and resistance training lowers body fat percentage in black South African women

Title amended as per the reviewer's suggestion.

The tittle does not fully reflect the content.

Title amended as per the reviewer's suggestion.

The authors did not provide study objectives. Instead, the aim of the study has been presented as the study objectives instead of the primary aim. I would suggest a section outline specific objectives of the study.

Included in aim's section.

Adequacy of study sample has not been described.

Included in methods and limitations sections. The present study employed a small scale proof-of-concept investigation pretest-posttest design with an experimental group and one control group using an intention-to-treat (ITT) analysis.

Authors did not describe the sample size calculation nor provide justification.

Included in methods and limitations sections. The present study employed a small scale proof-of-concept investigation pretest-posttest design with an experimental group and one control group using an intention-to-treat (ITT) analysis.

The blinding of investigators was not reported.

Included in methodology in section 3.1.

The blinding of subjects was not reported.

Included in section 3.1.

Authors have not adequately described the apparatus or tools used in the study.
Reported in section 3.2.

Identify procedures in sufficient detail to allow other workers to reproduce the results?
Procedures described in detail in section 3.2.

Authors have simply stated ‘Ethical clearance was obtained’ no other information of ethical considerations is provided.
More detail added in section 3.1.

Suggest removal of horizontal lines.
Lines have been removed.

Materials and methods are missing a lot of detail. I suggest addition of recruitment strategies, a flow chart showing number of participants enrolled, included/excluded, and lost to follow up. Where was the study conducted (i.e. in a lab, sports field). Why the 6-minute walk test? Is it the best measure of aerobic fitness in 18-25-year-old females?
Requested information added to sections 3.1 and 3.2.

Discussion: This is a very important study on young females. Authors could consider expanding on the discussion to really highlight the important findings and bring attention to the scant scientific research on women in South Africa.
Added to section 5.

Authors indicated the study is cross-sectional which I think is incorrect. The authors could consider adding that 1) no dietary information was collected (was the COM eating the same as the control group). Menstrual cycle logs (as this can obscure primary variables including body percentage and aerobic fitness).
Included in section 5.1.

What additional information would you need to reproduce this study? Methods used to recruit study participants. Were incentives given?
Included in section 3.1.

Were exercise sessions supervised?

Included in section 3.3.

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 28 Oct 2020

Dear EIC,
The revisions have been deemed satisfactory.
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.
Regards