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.110753
Published in: Asian Journal of Sports Medicine: 12(2); e110753

Peer Review Report for "The Inclusion in WADA Prohibited List Is Not Always Supported by Scientific Evidence: A Narrative Review"

Author(s): Eduard Bezuglov, Oleg Talibov, Mikhail Butovskiy, Vladimir Khaitin, Evgeny Achkasov, Zbigniew Waśkiewicz , Artemii Lazarev

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 31 Oct 2020
Revised Date: 2 Dec 2020
Accepted Date: 17 Jan 2021

Revision (0)

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

Farzin Halabchi: Reviewer | Revision (0) 5 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
I think some important issues should be considered by the authors.
1) Why did you select these 5 drugs? Please explain your rationale for this selection in the introduction.
2) When you do any judgment regarding existing evidence, you should conduct a systematic search using a pre-defined search strategy explaining the review process of documents, study periods, language, and .....
3) Why your search is restricted to Pubmed results?
4) Why do you think non-English articles (for example; Russian ones) lack scientific standards?
5) What do you mean regarding scientific standards? Please clarify.
6) Line 38: The number is related to the total tests and not positive tests.
7) Line 71: Epinephrine has not any threshold in the WADA list. However, it is not prohibited in local administration.
8) Authors have mentioned four main sections in the list and counted 3 sections. I think

they should add the "drugs in monitoring program" with an "-" at the start of the sentence. Furthermore, there are multiple errors in grammar, punctuations, journal manuscript styles (including bibliography), line spacing, and fonts throughout the manuscript which should be corrected. Some examples are:
Lines 98-117: Line spacing should be consistent.
Line 58: The sentence is incomplete.
Line 61: enhance or enhances?!
Line 87: bemitil or bemethyl? Please be consistent.
Line 97: [9] is underlined!
Line 151: The sentence begins with "and"!
Line 284: Extra "by".
Lines 299-302: Inappropriate font!
Line 327: Extra "that".
Line 331: Extra "this"
Line 472: Extra "that"
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 1 Dec 2020

Dear EIC,
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.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 1 Dec 2020

Dear Authors,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Asian J Sports Med. Your manuscript has now been reviewed by a reviewer 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:
Thank you for your interesting narrative review on an important topic of the prohibited list of drugs by WADA. Your critics on the inclusion of some drugs in the mentioned list are noteworthy. However, I think some important issues should be considered.

Thank you so much for you detailed review of our article. We are ready to further improve the quality of our article. We tried to address all of your comments.

1) Why did you select these 5 drugs? Please explain your rationale for this selection in the introduction.

Thank you for this comment. These substances and methods have not been banned for many years and are included (or are planned to be included) in the Prohibited List, not because due to new scientific data on their effectiveness among athletes have appeared, but for reasons unknown to the general public. And for their detection, athletes face or may face long-term disqualification - from four years, in other words, they are equated with substances that have a clearly proven effect for physical performance and are harmful to health (anabolic steroid, peptide hormones etc.)

Also, the usage of these substances was particularly very popular in population of athletes from post-Soviet countries.

2) When you do any judgment regarding existing evidence, you should conduct a systematic search using a pre-defined search strategy explaining the review process of documents, study periods, language, and .....

We agree with the reviewer. We searched for strictly defined words in a strictly defined time period in strictly selected databases. The analysis included works both in English and in any other languages included in the studied database.

3) Why your search is restricted to Pubmed results?

Thank you so much for this comment. This database is the largest medical database and it contains studies of not even of the highest quality in different languages (including Russian), in which the data of interest to us could be published. But in fact, other Databases were also studied, if we found references in article in Pubmed to other databases, such as Scopus, however no studies were found that matched the search criteria. Also, we used the framework used in other published work on similar topic:

Heuberger JAAC, Cohen AF. Review of WADA Prohibited Substances: Limited Evidence for Performance-Enhancing Effects. Sports Med. *2019;49(4):525–539. doi:10.1007/s40279-018-1014-1*

4) Why do you think non-English articles (for example; Russian ones) lack scientific standards?

Thank you for your comment. The overwhelming majority of research in Russian on the topic of our search is published in journals not included in any of the largest peer-reviewed journal databases. These journals lack peer-review. Also, the studies we found in Russian are of low methodological quality and are not associated with athletes and physically active people. Also, none of the studies in English, the authors of which considered it necessary to include these substances in the list of prohibited ones, did not refer to studies by Russian authors.

5) What do you mean regarding scientific standards? Please clarify.

We mean the pyramid of the evidence detailed in the number of studies including the:

1. *Sackett DL, Straus SE, Richardson WS et al. Evidence-based medicine: how to practice and teach EBM. London: Churchill Livingstone, 2000.*
2. *Herbert R. Practical evidence-based physiotherapy. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: Elsevier/Churchill Livingstone, 2011.*
3. *Ardern CL. Systematic review hacks for the sports and exercise clinician: five essential methodological elements. Br J Sports Med. 2016;50(8):447–9.*

6) Line 38: The number is related to the total tests and not positive tests.

Thanks for that note. We corrected this typo.

7) Line 71: Epinephrine has not any threshold in the WADA list. However, it is not prohibited in local administration.

Thank you so much for this valuable note. We corrected this line.

8) Authors have mentioned four main sections in the list and counted 3 sections. I think they should add the "drugs in monitoring program" with an "-" at the start of the sentence.

Thank you for pointing this out. This is very valuable comment. We corrected this to “3 sections” (because formally, there are 3 sections in the list) and emphasized that there is monitoring list.

Furthermore, there are multiple errors in grammar, punctuations, journal manuscript styles (including bibliography), line spacing, and fonts throughout the manuscript which should be corrected. Some examples are:
Lines 98-117: Line spacing should be consistent.

We agree with the reviewer. We went through the article and corrected minor mistakes.

Line 58: The sentence is incomplete.

Thanks for that note. We corrected this typo.

Line 61: enhance or enhances?!

Thank you so much for this comments. It has the potential to enhance or [it actually] enhances You can find that rule here.

https://www.wada-ama.org/en/questions-answers/prohibited-list-qa#:~:text=The%20WADA%20Prohibited%20List%20may,is%20outlined%20in%20the%20Code*).*

Line 87: bemitil or bemethyl? Please be consistent.

Many thanks for this comment. We corrected it to "bemethyl."

Line 97: [9] is underlined!

Thanks for that note. We corrected this typo.

Line 151: The sentence begins with "and"!

We agree with the reviewer. We corrected this mistake.

Line 284: Extra "by".

We agree with the reviewer. We corrected this mistake.

Lines 299-302: Inappropriate font!

We agree with the reviewer. We corrected this mistake.

Line 327: Extra "that".

We agree with the reviewer. We corrected this mistake.

Line 331: Extra "this"

We agree with the reviewer. We corrected this mistake.

Line 472: Extra "that"

We agree with the reviewer. We corrected this mistake.

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) 7 Jan 2021

Dear AE,'
Thanks for the corrections and modifications. I think the manuscript is eligible to be published, now.
Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 17 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,
As the authors improved their manuscript based on the reviewer's recommendations, I think it can be accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 17 Jan 2021

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