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.87871
Published in: Asian Journal of Sports Medicine: 10(4); e87871

Peer Review Report for "Anthropometric Indicators of Body Image Dissatisfaction and Perception Inconsistency in Young Rhythmic Gymnastics"

Author(s): Luciana Zaccagni, Natascia Rinaldo, Emanuela Gualdi-Russo

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 18 Dec 2018
Revised Date: 18 Aug 2019
Accepted Date: 9 Sep 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)

30 May 2019

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
Title
1) Proper Article TITLE?
a. The title should say: Anthropometric indicators of body image dissatisfaction and perception inconsistency in young rhythmic gymnastics
2) Does the title reflect the content appropriately?
a. Only add that the indicators studied are anthropometric
3) Is there any abbreviation in the TITLE?
a. Do not
4) Importance and originality or the subject? (Is the information, or the interpretation of the information, new?)
a. Regularly
5) Proper Authors' names and institutional affiliations?
a. Do not
6) Source(s) of support in the form of grants, equipment, drugs, or all of these?
a. Do not
Abstract

7) Is there structured ABSTRACT?

a. Yes

8) How many words are there in the ABSTRACT (Count = 250-350)?

a. 351 words

9) Accurateness and adequacy of the ABSTRACT? (Does the abstract describe the content accurately?)

a. Yes

10) Are KEYWORDS (3-10) selected form MESH

a. Yes

b. (http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/MBrowser.html)?

Introduction

11) Clarity of the objectives/hypotheses? (Are the objectives clearly stated?)

a. Yes

12) Does INTRODUCTION include: “What we know”, “What we don’t know” and “Aims”?

a. Regularly

Materials And Methods

13) Clearly describe selection of participants (patients or laboratory animals, including controls)?

a. Yes

14) Study Design Described Sufficiently?

a. Yes

15) Adequacy of the sample studied?

a. Yes

16) Subjects Representative of Target Population?

a. It is not mentioned how the population was selected

17) Provided sample size calculation or justification?

a. Do not

18) Control Subjects Appropriate?

a. Do not

19) Power of study declared?

a. Do not

20) Reported actual P values for primary analyses?

a. Yes

21) Blinding of Investigators (if possible)?

a. Do not

22) Blinding of subjects (if possible)?

a. Do not

23) Identify the methods, apparatus (give the manufacturer’s name and address in parentheses)?

a. Yes

24) Identify procedures in sufficient detail to allow other workers to reproduce the results?

a. Yes

25) Give references to established methods and brief descriptions for methods that have been published but are not well known?

a. Yes

26) Describe new or substantially modified methods, give reasons for using them, and

evaluate their limitations?

a. Regularly

27) Identify precisely all drugs and chemicals used, including generic name(s), dose(s), and route(s) of administration?

a. Does not apply

28) Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria Explained?

a. Do not

29) Appropriate Statistical Analysis?

a. Yes

30) Identified all statistical methods unambiguously?

a. Yes

31) Explain Ethical Considerations?

a. Yes

Review Articles

32) Authors submitting review manuscripts should include a section describing the methods used for locating, selecting, extracting, and synthesizing data?

Case Report

33) Proper writing of principles and elements of Medical History?

34) Indicating of Paraclinic examination?

35) Is there any Image, figures and tables for Case presentation?

36) Consideration of medical ethics for case presentation? (Are there any special ethical concerns arising from the use of human or other animal subjects?)

Results

37) Accuracy of the interpretation of RESULTS?

a. The interpretation of the results are appropriate

38) RESULTS recorded appropriately?

a. the results are appropriate

39) Appropriateness, clarity, and adequacy of the TABLES AND FIGURES?

a. All good

40) Present results in logical sequence in the text, tables, and illustrations, giving the main or most important findings?

a. Yes

41) Repeat the data in the tables and Text?

a. A little

42) Emphasize or summarize only important observations?

a. A little

43) Any Appendix for extra or supplementary materials and technical detail?

a. Does not apply

b.

44) Restrict tables and figures to those needed to explain the argument of the paper and to assess its support?

a. Yes

45) Use graphs as an alternative to tables with many entries?

a. Do not

46) Duplicate data in graphs and tables?

a. Does not apply

47) Use technical terms as non-technical in statistics, such as “random” (which implies a randomizing device), “normal,” “significant,” “correlations,” and “sample.”?

a. Do not

Discussion

48) Relevance of the DISCUSSION section?

a. Poor

49) CONCLUSIONS justified & substantiated?

a. It does not present conclusions

50) What CONCLUSIONS would you draw from these results?

a. It does not present conclusions

51) Analysis supports CONCLUSIONS?

a. It does not present conclusions

52) Are the conclusions supported by the discussion?

a. It does not present conclusions

References

53) Appropriateness of the REFERENCES?

a. They are appropriate

54) Proper Writing of the REFERENCES?

a. The authors present adequate references

55) References for the last 5 years?

a. The authors present updated references

56) Which type of writing is observed for references (Vancouver, Harward, Oxford, etc)?

a. Vancouver

57) Indicate references in parentheses?

a. Yes

General Review

58) Proper Style for Medical Writing?

a. Yes

59) Define unique terms and acronyms the first time used?

a. Yes

60) Proper English Grammar and Writing?

a. I'm not the one to judge

61) Which sections are too long?

a. Results

62) Which sections are too short?

a. No one

63) Which sections of this manuscript could be misunderstood?

a. Results and discussion

64) Describe the three major weaknesses of this paper:

a. Information not relevant, poor discussion and no conclusions

65) What additional information would you need to reproduce this study?

a. No one

66) Your Final Conclusion is: Approve, Minor Revision, Major Revision, Decline

a. Major Revision

Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 2 Aug 2019

Dear AE,
I am pleased to review the manuscript entitled “Indicators of body image dissatisfaction and perception inconsistency in young rhythmic gymnastics”. Authors studied anthropocentric traits and body composition parameters in gymnasts and controls and between competitive and non-competitive subgroups of gymnasts. The topic of study is interesting and valuable and the article has been written properly, but it needs to some minor correction in method section before final decision.
Comments:
Introduction:
- The Introduction provide a lengthy and detailed review of the field.
Methodology:
- No rationale for sample size has not be given.
- Selection criteria and exclusion criteria in each group are not mentioned.
Results:
- Confidence interval for some quantities significant variables should be presented as a practical implication of this report.
Discussion:
- The limitations of this study should explain at the end of discussion.
References:
- References are not enough up to date.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 2 Aug 2019

Dear EIC,
this manuscript was reviewed by our reviewers. As initial decision, your manuscript was found interesting but some revisions have to be made before it can reach a publishable value.
Thanks,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 2 Aug 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.

Dear Editor,

I would like to thank you and the two Referees for giving us the opportunity to improve our manuscript entitled "**Anthropometric indicators of body image dissatisfaction and perception inconsistency in young rhythmic gymnastics**" (*title modified*) providing us with very helpful comments and suggestions. Taking into account the comments and suggestions of the anonymous Referees, we have carefully revised the text. We are now very hopeful that this revised version will be accepted for publication on your prestigious journal.

Here, I submit the revised text (changes highlighted) and below our answers to the questions and the comments of the reviewers.

Thank you for your consideration,

Sincerely

Reviewer 1

Journal Name: Asian Journal of Sports Medicine

Manuscript title: … Indicators of body image dissatisfaction and perception inconsistency in young rhythmic gymnastics

R1Q: Proper Article TITLE?

1)The title should say: Anthropometric indicators of body image dissatisfaction and perception inconsistency in young rhythmic gymnastics
2)Does the title reflect the content appropriately? Only add that the indicators studied are anthropometric
3) Is there any abbreviation in the TITLE?
a. Do not
4) Importance and originality or the subject? (Is the information, or the interpretation of the information, new?)
a. Regularly
5) Proper Authors' names and institutional affiliations?
a. Do not
6) Source(s) of support in the form of grants, equipment, drugs, or all of these?
a. Do not

R: We have now modified the title according to your suggestion

R1Q: Abstract and keywords

7) Is there structured ABSTRACT?
a. Yes
8) How many words are there in the ABSTRACT (Count = 250-350)?
a. 351 words
9) Accurateness and adequacy of the ABSTRACT? (Does the abstract describe the content accurately?)
a. Yes
10) Are KEYWORDS (3-10) selected form MESH
a. Yes
b. (http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/MBrowser.html)?

R: Thank you for your comments

R1Q: Introduction

11) Clarity of the objectives/hypotheses? (Are the objectives clearly stated?)
a. Yes
12) Does INTRODUCTION include: "What we know", "What we don't know" and "Aims"?
a. Regularly

R: Thank you for your comments

R1Q: Materials And Methods

13) Clearly describe selection of participants (patients or laboratory animals, including controls)?
a. Yes
14) Study Design Described Sufficiently?
a. Yes
15) Adequacy of the sample studied?
a. Yes
16) Subjects Representative of Target Population?
a. It is not mentioned how the population was selected
17)Provided sample size calculation or justification?
a. Do not
18) Control Subjects Appropriate?
a. Do not
19) Power of study declared?
a. Do not
20) Reported actual P values for primary analyses?
a. Yes
21) Blinding of Investigators (if possible)?
a. Do not
22) Blinding of subjects (if possible)?
a. Do not
23) Identify the methods, apparatus (give the manufacturer's name and address in parentheses)?
a. Yes
24) Identify procedures in sufficient detail to allow other workers to reproduce the results?
a. Yes
25) Give references to established methods and brief descriptions for methods that have been published but are not well known?
a. Yes
26) Describe new or substantially modified methods, give reasons for using them, and evaluate their limitations?
a. Regularly
27) Identify precisely all drugs and chemicals used, including generic name(s), dose(s), and route(s) of administration?
a. Does not apply
28) Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria Explained?
a. Do not
29) Appropriate Statistical Analysis?
a. Yes
30) Identified all statistical methods unambiguously?
a. Yes
31) Explain Ethical Considerations?
a. Yes

R: We have now described more in detail the selection/exclusion criteria for the study's sample and added more detailed information about the recruitment of the control group

R1Q: Results

37) Accuracy of the interpretation of RESULTS?
a. The interpretation of the results are appropriate
38) RESULTS recorded appropriately?
a. the results are appropriate
39) Appropriateness, clarity, and adequacy of the TABLES AND FIGURES?
a. All good
40) Present results in logical sequence in the text, tables, and illustrations, giving the main or most important findings?
a. Yes
41) Repeat the data in the tables and Text?
a. A little
42) Emphasize or summarize only important observations?
a. A little
43) Any Appendix for extra or supplementary materials and technical detail?
a. Does not apply
44) Restrict tables and figures to those needed to explain the argument of the paper and to assess its support?
a. Yes
45) Use graphs as an alternative to tables with many entries?
a. Do not
46) Duplicate data in graphs and tables?
a. Does not apply
47) Use technical terms as non-technical in statistics, such as "random" (which implies a randomizing device), "normal," "significant," "correlations," and "sample."?
a. Do not

R: Dear Reviewer, we have now reviewed the results section and checked for repetitions.

R1Q: Discussion

48) Relevance of the DISCUSSION section?

a. Poor

R: we have now modified the discussion accordingly

R1Q: CONCLUSIONS

49) justified & substantiated?
a. It does not present conclusions
50) What CONCLUSIONS would you draw from these results?
a. It does not present conclusions
51)vAnalysis supports CONCLUSIONS?
a. It does not present conclusions
52) Are the conclusions supported by the discussion?
a. It does not present conclusions

R: We have now added the conclusions

R1Q: References

53) Appropriateness of the REFERENCES?
a. They are appropriate
54) Proper Writing of the REFERENCES?
a. The authors present adequate references
55) References for the last 5 years?
a. The authors present updated references
56) Which type of writing is observed for references (Vancouver, Harward, Oxford, etc)?
a. Vancouver
57) Indicate references in parentheses?
a. Yes

R: Thank you for your comments

R1Q: General Review

58) Proper Style for Medical Writing?
a. Yes
59) Define unique terms and acronyms the first time used?
a. Yes
60) Proper English Grammar and Writing?
a. I'm not the one to judge
61) Which sections are too long?
a. Results
62) Which sections are too short?
a. No one
63) Which sections of this manuscript could be misunderstood?
a. Results and discussion
64)Describe the three major weaknesses of this paper:
a. Information not relevant, poor discussion and no conclusions
65) What additional information would you need to reproduce this study?
a. No one
66) Your Final Conclusion is: Approve, Minor Revision, Major Revision, Decline
a. Major Revision

R: we have now deleted some non-relevant information. In addition, the discussion has been expanded and conclusions added.

Reviewer 2

R2: I am pleased to review the manuscript entitled “Indicators of body image dissatisfaction and perception inconsistency in young rhythmic gymnastics”. Authors studied anthropometric traits and body composition parameters in gymnasts and controls and between competitive and non-competitive subgroups of gymnasts. The topic of study is interesting and valuable and the article has been written properly, but it needs to some minor correction in method section before final decision.

A: Thank you for your positive comments and for your suggestions to improve our manuscript.

Comments:

R2Q: Introduction

- The Introduction provide a lengthy and detailed review of the field.

R: Thank you for your positive comment.

R2Q: Methodology:

- No rationale for sample size has not be given.

- Selection criteria and exclusion criteria in each group are not mentioned.

R: we have now described more in detail the selection criteria for the study's sample and the control group.

R2Q: Results:

- Confidence interval for some quantities significant variables should be presented as a practical implication of this report.

R: Confidence interval was now added in table 1 for competitive and non-competitive gymnasts

R2Q: Discussion:

- The limitations of this study should explain at the end of discussion.

R: the limitations of the study were added at the end of the discussion as suggested

R2Q: References:

- References are not enough up to date.

R: we have now updated the references-

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) 9 Sep 2019

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 9 Sep 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.
We look forward to working with you again in the future.
Thanks.