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.85984
Published in: Asian Journal of Sports Medicine: 10(2); e85984

Peer Review Report for "Physical Performance Tests in Male and Female Sitting Volleyball Players: Pilot Study of Brazilian National Team"

Author(s): Shirko Ahmadi, Marco Carlos Uchida, Gustavo Luiz Gutierrez

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	1 Nov 2018
Revised Date:	12 Feb 2019
Accepted Date:	15 Mar 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)

28 Dec 2018

Dear AE,
Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript which considers some interesting applied issues. This study appears to be novel, but as submitted needs considerable work on the presentation. Much of this relates to the use of English, particularly in the introduction and the discussion, but there is also room for improvement in the detailed presentation of the results. I have suggested some specific comments, and some of these may serve as examples of issues, but the comments are not exhaustive and the whole manuscript needs to be carefully reviewed to consider the use of English and the application of the scientific writing style.
- First, the manuscript is very poorly written. The poor grammar detracts significantly from the readability of the manuscript.
- Second, the author does not provide a strong rationale for the study.
- Abstract:
The body height is missing (also in method section).
Please to shown any differences for training/volume between both groups.
Please to shown the reliability of the measures.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 4 Jan 2019

Dear EIC,
This manuscript was reviewed by our reviewers. The reviewers have raised concerns regarding the manuscript, and therefore, this 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 authors wish to undertake major revisions and re-submit, addressing the referees' concerns.
- Please, provide Funding/Support and Ethical Approval for your manuscript. They must be inserted in full manuscript file.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 4 Jan 2019

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.

Dr. Vahid Ziaee

Editor-in-Chief

Asian Journal of Sports Medicine

editor@asjsm.com

Jan 25, 2019

Subject: Revision and resubmission of manuscript 85984

Dear Dr Ziaee,

Thank you for your letter and the opportunity to revise our paper on 'Physical performance tests in men and women sitting volleyball players: pilot study of Brazilian national team'. The suggestions offered by the reviewers have been immensely helpful, and we also appreciate your insightful comments on revising the abstract and other aspects of the paper. We have addressed the Reviewers' comments point by point below. The changed and added texts in the revised manuscript are shown in green highlights. Line numbers we mention in responses refer to manuscript version with tracked changes.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript which considers some interesting applied issues. This study appears to be novel, but as submitted needs considerable work on the presentation.

Authors' Response: We thank the reviewer for this positive feedback.

The manuscript is very poorly written.

Authors' Response: We regret there were problems with the English. The paper has been carefully revised by a native English speaker to improve the grammar and readability.

The author does not provide a strong rationale for the study

Authors' Response: Thank you for this valuable feedback. Our research is the first study in sitting volleyball which clearly compares men and women in terms of physical performance (page 3, line 13 & 14). additionally, in sitting volleyball both genders of different ages can play together, except in the high levels and formal competitions (page 2, starting line 14 & 15).

The body height is missing (in abstract and method section).

Authors' Response: thank you for showing this up. We have added it (Abstract: page 1, line 9 & 10; Methods: page 3 line 24, page 4 line 1; Table 1: page 16).

In abstract part, please to shown any differences for training/volume between both groups

Authors' Response: thank you. We have added it (page 1, line 11).

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

Please, provide Funding/Support and Ethical Approval for your manuscript. They must be inserted in full manuscript file.

Authors' Response: thank you for flagging this up. We have added them (Ethical Approval: page 10, line 14; Funding/Support: page 10, line 16; Conflict of Interests: page 10, line 17).

The revisions have been approved by all three authors and I have again been chosen as the corresponding author. We hope the revised manuscript will better suit the *Asian Journal of Sports Medicine*, and we thank you for your continued interest in our research.

Sincerely,

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 15 Mar 2019

Dear EIC,
The authors have modified the manuscript accordingly and has provided specific answers in an accurate manner. I suggest that this version is suitable for publication in the Asian J Sports Med.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 15 Mar 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.