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://sites.kowsarpub.com/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Asian Journal of Sports Medicine
Article DOI: 10.5812/asjsm.79930
Published in: Asian Journal of Sports Medicine: 10(1); e79930

Peer Review Report for "Saudi Professional League: A Prospective Study of the Injuries and Illnesses Sustained by Professional Soccer Players During the 2015 - 2016 Season"

Author(s): Qassim I Muaidi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	29 May 2018
Revised Date:	17 Dec 2018
Accepted Date:	21 Dec 2018

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)

14 Oct 2018

Dear AE,
I found the data presented in the article valuable but I have some concerns about the presentation of the data.
0. it needs to be revised by a native speaker, there are many grammar errors, for example:
Soccer is [the] one of the most popular sports, the is redundant
Irrespective of [the] level of game or geographical, the is needed
Introduction (background):
1. The introduction can be improved if it follows the order of known>unknown>question/aim, there is no need for literature review in the introduction, these parts should be moved to discussion.
Methods:
2. there should be consents from each athlete in order to use their data, the consent from Saudi Football Federation and the Saudi Federation of Sports Medicine are not enough.
Results:
3. I can not follow this sentence: "The risk of injury was highest amongst defenders (n=130; 33%) and lowest amongst goalkeepers (n=43; 11%)." how could the

authors conclude the higher risk of injury based on the absolute number of injuries? it looks like that the number of defenders should be higher the goalkeepers, so should the absolute number of injuries.
4. the rate of injury is an important result in epidemiological studies like this paper and it needs the exposure time calculation.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 23 Nov 2018

Dear EIC,
This manuscript was reviewed by our reviewers. As initial decision, the manuscript was found interesting but some revisions have to be made before it can reach a publishable value.
In revise paper, the author please summarize discussion section and explain limitations of the study at the end of discussion.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 23 Nov 2018

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Asian J Sports Med. 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.

S.No	Reviewers comments	Authors response to reviewer's comments
1.	it needs to be revised by a native speaker, there are many grammar errors, for example: Soccer is [the] one of the most popular sports, the is redundant Irrespective of [the] level of game or geographical, the is needed	As per the suggestion of the reviewer language editing and proof reading of the article has been done by a professional agency. certificate attached
2.	introduction (background): 1. The introduction can be improved if it follows the order of known>unknown>question/aim, there is no need for literature review in the introduction, these parts should be moved to discussion.	Thank you for the comments 4 previous researches were cited in the introduction section **(ref no:4,7,10 & 11)** These for references were used in order to support the statement of the researcher **"it is important to have country-specific data to understand the injury pattern in a particular population**;(page no:4 para 2, line 13) The author thinks that these references are extremely necessary to state the objective of the study. If these references are removed the author won't be able to justify why this study is required.
3.	There should be consents from each athlete in order to use their data, the consent from Saudi Football Federation and the Saudi Federation of Sports Medicine are not enough.	The consent form was provided to the team physician and physical therapists of all clubs along with data collection form. The team physician /physical therapist has taken written informed consent from all the players with injury / illness. But it was not mentioned in the manuscript. This been added in the methodology section of the manuscript as" A written informed consent was taken from the participants of the study" (page: 7 para:2)
4.	I can not follow this sentence: "The risk of injury was highest amongst defenders (n=130; 33%) and lowest amongst goalkeepers (n=43; 11%)." how could the authors conclude the higher risk of injury based on the absolute number of injuries? it looks like that the number of defenders should be higher the goalkeepers, so should the absolute number of injuries.	Thank you for the comment The author also agrees with the reviewer's comments regarding the injury risk among various type of players participated in the study. Now the injury risk has been calculated according to per thousand athletic exposure[1] It has been re written as '**The risk of injury was highest among forwards (n==99;1903 injuries per thousand players) and lowest amongst goalkeepers (n=43; 878 injuries per thousand players**)'(Page 8 , para 2) Reference: 1. Roos KG, Wasserman EB, Dalton SL, Gray A, Djoko A, Dompier TP, Kerr ZY. Epidemiology

		of 3825 injuries sustained in six seasons of National Collegiate Athletic Association men's and women's soccer (2009/2010–2014/2015). Br J Sports Med. 2017;51(13):1029-34.
5.	the rate of injury is an important result in epidemiological studies like this paper and it needs the exposure time calculation.	Thank you for the comment The author also agrees with the reviewers' comment "the rate of injury is an important result in epidemiological studies like this paper and it needs the exposure time calculation." However, the current study is a prospective study for the entire 2015-16 football season consisting of 10 premier clubs in Saudi Arabia. The training and the matches were conducted at different regions of the kingdom and the players were keep on travelling. So, it was not feasible to record the time exposure for each player for the entire season. However, the author is working on how to record the time exposure also in future seasons. This has been written as a limitation of the current study and mentioned at the end of discussion as "**In most of the surveillance studies on sports injuries, the authors used 'time exposed to risk' as a major denominator (16,40). Unfortunately, due to the complexity of the season, this was not feasible in the current study**". (page 13, para 3) The current study used an injury surveillance form similar to that used in London summer Olympic games 2012[1], National collegiate athletic association (NCAA) for surveillance studies in soccer[2,3] and according to the guidelines of FMARC and IOC[4-6]. References: 1 Engebretsen L, Soligard T, Steffen K, Alonso JM, Aubry M, Budgett R, Dvorak J, Jegathesan M, Meeuwisse WH, Mountjoy M, Palmer-Green D. Sports injuries and illnesses during the London Summer Olympic Games 2012. Br J Sports Med. 2013 ;47(7):407-14. 2 Roos KG, Wasserman EB, Dalton SL, Gray A, Djoko A, Dompier TP, Kerr ZY. Epidemiology of 3825 injuries sustained in six seasons of

		National Collegiate Athletic Association men's and women's soccer (2009/2010–2014/2015). Br J Sports Med. 2017;51(13):1029-34. 3 Dick R, Putukian M, Agel J, Evans TA, Marshall SW. Descriptive epidemiology of collegiate women's soccer injuries: National Collegiate Athletic Association Injury Surveillance System, 1988–1989 through 2002–2003. Journal of athletic training. 2007;42(2):278. 4 Junge A, Dvorak J, Graf-Baumann T, Peterson L. Football injuries during FIFA tournaments and the Olympic Games, 1998-2001: development and implementation of an injury-reporting system. The American journal of sports medicine. 2004;32(1_suppl):80-9. 5 Junge A, Engebretsen L, Alonso JM, Renström P, Mountjoy ML, Aubry M, Dvorak J. Injury surveillance in multi-sport events-the IOC approach. British journal of sports medicine. 2008 Apr 7. 6 Fuller CW, Ekstrand J, Junge A, Andersen TE, Bahr R, Dvorak J, et al. Consensus statement on injury definitions and data collection procedures in studies of football (soccer) injuries. Scand J Med Sci Sports. 2006;16(2):83-92.
6.	**Associate editor comment:** In revise paper, please summarize discussion section and explain limitations of the study at the end of discussion.	The limitation of the study has already been explained at the end of discussion section (page no: 13 &14)

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: EIC | **Revision (1)** 21 Dec 2018

Dear Author,

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.