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.106782
Published in: Asian Journal of Sports Medicine: 12(1); e106782

Peer Review Report for "Role of Exergame Play on Cardiorespiratory Fitness and Body Composition in Overweight and Obese Children"

Author(s): Anneke van Biljon, Glynis Longhurst, Ina Shaw, Brandon Stuwart Shaw

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	23 Jun 2020
Revised Date:	23 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) — 21 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
This is an interesting study and concisely written. All sections are adequately and appropriately presented except for the Intervention section. I would like to suggest the author(s) elaborate on the activity that the traditional video gaming group underwent.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 26 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
- The article is written in clear and concise English language and it is original work without plagiarism. In this randomized trial article, the abstract is written in a well-structured manner showing the summary of the trial design, methods, results, and conclusions. The scientific background is well set, and the rationale of the study is clearly articulated. The objective of the study is specific and very clear
- The authors present the trial design in a clear manner. The eligibility criteria of the participants are well set out and very clear, hence the reader can identify the three different

groups which were randomly assigned to the three groups. The setting of the research is included and is clear. The randomization method employed using a schedule generated from a random numbers table is appropriate and controls for bias. The authors present the intervention of exergaming and present the exergaming group, the traditional gaming group, and the control group with enough detail to allow for replication of the study. It is clear from the writing how the body composition variables and other fitness parameters were measured and assessed and, their relationship to the activity whose effect is being sought is relevant.
- The results are very well summarized in a table using means and standard deviations, and the t-test statistic used to determine whether there were any differences between the pre-intervention results and post-intervention results is very appropriate. The use of percentages to determine the magnitude of change in the waist to hip ratio and resting heart rate arguments the use of the t-test statistic and p-value.
The authors address the source of potential bias by indicating that the study did not measure exercise intensity during the intervention. The authors compare their results with similar studies in their discussion and showing how they relate to those of others.
- Citing and referencing are done appropriately. The study meets the requirements of a randomized control trial very well.
I, therefore, accept that it be published as it is.
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.

REPONSES TO REVIEWERS COMMENTS

Manuscript Title: Role of Exergame Play on Cardiorespiratory Fitness and Body Composition in Overweight and Obese Children

Dear Reviewers, thank you very much for your comments and recommendations. We have amended the paper accordingly and hope that the changes meet your approval.

REVIEWER #2 COMMENTS	RESPONSE TO REVIEWER
This is an interesting study and concisely written. All sections are adequately and appropriately presented except for the Intervention section. I would like to suggest the author(s) to elaborate on the activity that the traditional video gaming group underwent.	Additional details on the activity that the traditional video gaming group underwent are provided under 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: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 29 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
Changes have been made following my previous comments/review.
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.
Regards