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.85697
Published in: Asian Journal of Sports Medicine: 10(4); e85697

Peer Review Report for "A Review of High-Risk Rapid Weight Loss Behaviors with Assessment of Food Intake and Anthropometric Measurements in Combat Sport Athletes"

Author(s): Mehnoosh Samadi, Miaad Chaghazardi, Amir Bagheri, Sheno Karimi, Yahya Pasdar, Mohammad Hozoori, Shima Moradi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 23 Oct 2018
Revised Date: 5 Sep 2019
Accepted Date: 5 Oct 2019

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)

23 Nov 2018

Dear AE,
In the manuscript, the authors tried to review high-risk behaviors used for rapid weight loss and to assess food intake and anthropometric data in combat sports athletes. In the literature, the topic of this study was well investigated, and providing a synthesis of all these studies remains with an important interest.
This study presents an undeniable novelty and originality and could be, after a few corrections, published in the Asian Journal of Sports Medicine.
Major comments:
1. In my view, the effects of a rapid weight loss on competitive performance are certainly harmful. The problem of this study resides mainly in the methods used to decrease weight, not in effects.
2. The Methods section should be rewritten. Authors should provide what they have done point by point.
3. The processes for selecting studies and data are not clear.
4. The methods used for assessing the risk of bias are not described and those who may

affect the cumulative evidence are not specified.
5. The methods of handling data and combining the results of studies are not described.
6. In the Results section, in my view, authors should present all stages of the selection of studies with reasons for exclusions at each stage, in a flow diagram.
7. In my view, authors should present the results of individual studies in a manner that emerges the differences between studies, ideally with a forest plot.
8. In the Discussion section, authors should discuss limitations at the study and outcome level.
- Special remarks
Abstract
9. Low-carb diets (Low-carbohydrate diets). Please rectify.
10. Keywords: I think that the term "combat sports" is very important.
Results
11. In my view, 2.3. The section should be structured as follows: 2.3.1. Anthropometric status, 2.3.2. Physiological status and 2.3.3. Athletic Performance.
12. The authors should add the weight loss durations, the number of participants at each study, and the method used to decrease weight.
Conclusion
13. Should be rewritten. A conclusion is where the authors can summarize the paper's findings and generalize their importance. It is also, where they can raise questions, discuss ambiguous data, and recommend places for further research.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 21 Dec 2018

Dear EIC,
The manuscript was reviewed by our reviewer(s). The reviewer(s) have raised concerns regarding the manuscript, and therefore, the paper is not acceptable for publication in this format. However since the reviewers do find some merit in the paper, I would be willing to reconsider if the author wish to undertake major revisions and re-submit, addressing the referees' concerns.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 21 Dec 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.

Dear Editor and Reviewers,

We highly appreciate the detailed valuable comments of the reviewers on our manuscript (85697). The suggestions are quite helpful for us and we incorporate them in the revised paper. As below, on behalf of my co-authors, I would like to clarify some of the points raised by the Reviewer. We hope the Reviewer and the Editors will be satisfied with our responses to the comments and the revisions for the original manuscript. Revisions in yellow color are highlighted.

Thanks and Best Regards,

Corresponding author

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

In the manuscript, the authors tried to review high-risk behaviors used for rapid weight loss, and to assess food intake and anthropometric data in combat sports athletes. In the literature, the topic of this study was well investigated, and providing a synthesis of all these studies remains with an important interest. This study present an undeniable novelty and originality and could be, after a few corrections, published in the Asian Journal of Sports Medicine.

Major comments:

- In my view, the effects of a rapid weight loss on competitive performance are certainly harmful. The problematic of this study resides mainly in the methods used to decrease weight not in effects.

Response: in the part of Abstract, Introduction and Result add the effects of rapid weight loss on health-related parameters

The Methods section should be rewritten. Authors should provide what they have done point by point.

Response: This point was done. Search and study selection was performed again and method part was rewritten.

The processes for selecting studies and data are not clear.

Response: Studies selection was rewritten with more details.

The methods used for assessing risk of bias are not described and those who may affect the cumulative evidence are not specified.

Response: We assessed quality of study using the Newcastle-Ottawa scale (NOS), for assessing the quality of non- randomized studies in review studies. Based on this scale, all of reviewed studies were considered high quality. These descriptions were added to the manuscript.

The methods of handling data and combining results of studies are not described.

Response:It was edited.

In the Results section, in my view, authors should present all stages of the selection of studies with reasons for exclusions at each stage, in a flow diagram.

Response: The procedures for selecting studies with exclusions at each stage were shown in a flowchart.

In my view, authors should present the results of individual studies in a manner that emerges the differences between studies, ideally with a forest plot.

Response: The results of studies was rewritten with more details

In the Discussion section, authors should discuss limitations at study and outcome level.

Response: Outcome and limitations of our study was mentioned in the Discussion section.

Special remarks

Abstract

Low-carb diets (Low-carbohydrates diets). Please rectify.

Response: This point done.

Key words: I think that the term "combat sports" is very important.

Response: This point done.

Results

In my view, the 2.3. Section should be structured as follows: 2.3.1. Anthropometric status, 2.3.2. Physiological status and 2.3.3. Athletic Performance.

Response: This point done.

Authors should add the weight loss durations, the number of participants at each study and the method used to decrease weight.

Response: This point done and added the information in result section.

Conclusion

Should be rewritten. A conclusion is where the authors can summarize the paper's findings and generalize their importance. It is also, where they can raise questions, discuss ambiguous data, and recommend places for further research.

Response: It was rewritten

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

Your manuscript was reviewed by our reviewer(s). The reviewer(s) have raised concerns regarding the manuscript, and therefore, your paper is not acceptable for publication in this format. However since the reviewers do find some merit in the paper, I would be willing to reconsider if you wish to undertake major revisions and re-submit, addressing the referees' concerns.

Response: Thanks and the manuscript was revised based on reviewer comments.

EIC Decision:

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.

Response: Thanks and the manuscript was revised based on reviewer comments.

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) 20 Aug 2019

Dear AE,
The authors have produced an immense effort to improve their study; however, there are several points that need clarification and correction before acceptance.
The paper needs to be proofread. There are many typographical errors, punctuation issues, and incorrect use of words throughout the paper. A native English-speaking person must go over the manuscript in order to correct the grammatical errors of which there are many.
Methods:
Study selection
1. 76 irrelevant articles were excluded: The exclusion criteria should be briefly mentioned.
2. The flowchart of study selection is missing.
Assessment of the study quality
1. NOS was developed to assess the quality of nonrandomized studies. The validity and reliability of the NOS have been questioned. It was claimed to be additionally supplemented because the guidelines to be applied to each evaluation item were unclear. Furthermore, Stang (2010) suggested serious errors in the systematic reviews that assessed the quality of observational studies using the NOS.
Results:
1. Data are scattered and readers should provide a lot of effort to arrange the specific ideas for each study. Therefore, we propose drawing up summary tables in which each article appears with all the necessary data.
References
1. References 5, 9, 18, 20, 21, 32, 33, 37, 42, and 45 should be rewritten according to the style of the revue.
See:
Jong-Myon Bae. A suggestion for quality assessment in systematic reviews of observational studies in nutritional epidemiology. Epidemiol Health 2016; 38: e2016014. Published online 2016 Apr 26. Doi: 10.4178/epih.e2016014
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 26 Aug 2019

Dear EIC,
The paper needs some more correction. The author should revise the paper, based on the reviewers' comments.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (1)** 26 Aug 2019

Dear Author,
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.

Dear Editor and Reviewers,

We highly appreciate the detailed valuable comments of the reviewers on our manuscript (85697). The suggestions are quite helpful for us and we incorporate them in the revised paper. As below, on behalf of my co-authors, I would like to clarify some of the points raised by the Reviewer. We hope the Reviewer and the Editors will be satisfied with our responses to the comments and the revisions for the original manuscript. Revisions in yellow color are highlighted.

Thanks and Best Regards,

Corresponding author

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

The authors have produced an immense effort to improve their study; however, there are several points that need clarification and correction before acceptance.

The paper needs to be proofread. There are many typographical errors, punctuation issues and incorrect use of words throughout the paper. A native English-speaking person must go over the manuscript in order to correct the grammatical errors of which there are many.

Response: This manuscript was reviewed by English editor and the modifications were marked using Track Changes.

Methods:
Study selection:
-76 irrelevant articles were excluded: The exclusion criteria should be briefly mentioned.

Response: These articles were excluded in which their hypotheses did not assess effect of RWL behaviors on food intake and anthropometric measurements.

-The flowchart of study selection is missing.

Response: This flowchart added to our manuscript.

Assessment of the study quality:

NOS was developed to assess the quality of nonrandomized studies. The validity and reliability of the NOS has been questioned. It was claimed to be additionally supplemented because the

guidelines to be applied to each evaluation item were unclear. Furthermore, Stang (2010) suggested serious errors in the systematic reviews that assessed the quality of observational studies using the NOS.

Response: Thanks, we considered assessment of the studies quality using STROBE checklist again.

Results:
Data are scattered and readers should provide a lot of effort to arrange the specific ideas to each study. Therefore, we propose drawing up summary tables in which each article appears with all necessary data.

Response: Thanks for your suggestion; we considered important results in table 1 and 2.

References
References 5, 9, 18, 20, 21, 32, 33, 37, 42 and 45 should be rewritten according the style of the revue.

Response: These references edited.

See:
Jong-Myon Bae. A suggestion for quality assessment in systematic reviews of observational studies in nutritional epidemiology. Epidemiol Health 2016; 38: e2016014. Published online 2016 Apr 26. Doi: 10.4178/epih.e2016014

Response: Thanks and edited.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

Your paper needs to some more correction. Please revise your paper, based on reviewer's comments.

Response: Thanks and the manuscript was revised based on reviewer comments.

EIC Decision:

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.

Response: Thanks and the manuscript was revised based on reviewer comments.

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.

Mohamed SAID: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 29 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
The authors have produced an immense effort to improve their study. In my view, the manuscript is now well written, contain factually accurate and verifiable information, is broad in coverage, neutral in point of view, stable, and illustrated by tables and figures.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 5 Oct 2019

Dear EIC,
Thanks to the author for the changes given in the manuscript based on reviewers' comments. It is now acceptable for publication.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 5 Oct 2019

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.