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.107042
Published in: Asian Journal of Sports Medicine: 12(2); e107042

Peer Review Report for "Effects of TRX Suspension Training on Proprioception and Muscle Strength in Female Athletes with Functional Ankle Instability"

Author(s): Ali Khorjahani , Masoud Mirmoezzi, Mina Bagheri, Mohammad Kalantariyan

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 5 Jul 2020
Revised Date: 18 Sep 2020
Accepted Date: 3 Nov 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)

9 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
I have gladly accepted to participate in the review process in your reputable journal. The topic dealt with by the authors within the reviewed manuscript is quite current and the obtained results indicate a possible practical application both in the prevention and post-rehabilitation of ankle injuries. The main shortcomings of the study are more technical and linguistic in nature, and if the authors take the comments and responses to the requests seriously, I will be happy to participate in the further review process. Which certainly indicates the potential that the study deserves to be published if the stated conditions are met.
Thanks

Hojjat Radinmehr: Reviewer | Revision (0)

11 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
It is an interesting study, but a major revision is needed.
The whole text needs to be revised grammatically.

This manuscript needs to be revised conceptually. Some bugs are mentioned in the first paragraphs of the article in the attachment file.
Thanks

Noureddin Nakhostin Ansari: Associate Editor | **Revision (**0**)** 19 Aug 2020

Dear EIC,
The title should define the acronym TRX. Abbreviations should be defined when used for the first time in the text (e.g. Abstract, line 9, TRX). English should be checked for errors. Methods should include the Design used before the Participants. For MMT, the Median (IQR) should be reported and thus statistical analyses must be adapted accordingly. Ethical approval of the study should be mentioned. Information about the assessors and blinding should be reported. Sufficient data on the reliability of the measurements should be provided.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (**0**)** 24 Aug 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.

Reviewer #1	
What is this abbreviation?	Total Resistance exercises (TRX)
What is this about?	The correct sentence was replaced
The role of other rehabilitation methods is not considered. What is the advantage of this method?	The sentence was replaced and clarified.
TRX?	It was changed based on Mesh and added to the keywords. http://id.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/D055070
Incomplete sentence	Recurrent, symptomatic ankle sprain and the subjective feeling of ankle instability (or both) due to sensorimotor deficits is extremely common.
It is better to correct the sentence. This sentence is hard to read.	The sentence was replaced and clarified.
Is proprioception accuracy is a function or a precise sense? The sentence needs correction.	Proprioception is the sense of self-movement and body position. The sentence was corrected.
These sentences need to be corrected in choosing the type of words and concepts.	The sentence was replaced and clarified.
It is better to be concise and practical.	The conclusion was rewritten.
Reviewer #2	
This is confusing statement “functional and high-risk tasks”, please clarify?	Especially in high-impact sports. The sentence was replaced and clarified.
It is recommended to be at least one decimal place for years, cm and kg, if mean values were presented in that manner, try to be consistent through all manuscript.	Done.
This is inappropriate term “their relevant” , prescribed or program exercises, or something similar, but “their” is not one of solutions.	The sentence was replaced and clarified.
In objective it is stated “six weeks” and here is “6 weeks”, first option is more appropriate, and try to be consistent in using one term so decide which is going to be used.	Done.
“0” need to be before “.”	Done.
“doing” is not good choice, try with application, or something more precise from exercise methodology.	
Do not use terms from title in keywords, and it is recommended to use MESH terms by Journal instructions.	It was changed based on Mesh and added to the keywords.
This statement has to be supported by reference or references!	Reference added.
And what? A whole this list is written very confusing, please rearrange it or put as a table, or some similar solution, punctuation mark are quite confusing.	The sentence was replaced and clarified.
This is a wrong way to sentence beginning, as I understand this is the type of measuring	Done.

instrument. Simple state that: Body height was peasuret using...and in brackets put the company and country of manufacturer. The same as you have done in following text.	
This is strange word construction and it is difficult to understand the meaning?	The sentence was replaced and clarified.
Please clarification?	several anatomical planes
“sensory” or “sensors”?	proprioceptive sensors
? applied to the articular	applied to the joint
Kindly check Journal instructions for referencing and correct it all.	Checked and clarified.
Reviewer #3	
The title should define the acronym TRX. Abbreviations should be defined when used for the first time in the text (e.g. Abstract, line 9, TRX). English should be checked for errors. Methods should include the Design used before the Participants. For MMT, the Median (IQR) should be reported and thus statistical analyses must be adapted accordingly. Ethical approval of the study should be mentioned. Information about the assessors and blinding should be reported. Sufficient data on the reliability of the measurements should be provided.	Title, Abbreviations, English errors, Methods, Ethical approval, blind study, Reliability in manuscript checked, Changed and clarified.

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) 10 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
The authors have fully responded to all the requests of the reviewers, and accordingly, I agree that this manuscript deserves to be published in your esteemed journal.
Kind regards

Hojjat Radinmehr: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 11 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
- All text needs grammatical editing.
- In the background section;
- Second-line, "the sensorimotor deficits ..." the sentence is incomplete.
- In the sixth line, "possible intrinsic risk ..." the sentence needs to be corrected.

Thanks

Noureddin Nakhostin Ansari: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 15 Sep 2020

Dear EIC,
The authors have addressed all issues. There is only a minor issue on page 2, Background, lines 35-37 that should be corrected. After the correction of this error, the manuscript would be acceptable for publication.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 16 Sep 2020

Dear Authors,
The second round of peer review of your manuscript is completed. I now have the reports of the Referees, which suggest that your manuscript needs more correction.
Thanks

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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.

Reviewer #1	
In the background section	
Second-line, "the sensorimotor deficits ..." the sentence is incomplete.	Is replacing as... The verb was added to the sentence.
In the sixth line, "possible intrinsic risk ..." the sentence needs to be corrected.	The sentence was replaced and clarified. These include deficits in postural sway, range of motion, voluntary strength, proprioception, and previous sprains.
Associate Editor 1:	
Authors have addressed all issues. There is only a minor issue on page 2, Background, lines 35-37 that should be corrected. After the correction of this error, the manuscript would be acceptable for publication.	Done.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Hojjat Radinmehr: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 27 Oct 2020

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

Noureddin Nakhostin Ansari: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 1 Nov 2020

Dear EIC,
The issues raised are all addressed. It can be now accepted for publication.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 3 Nov 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