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.91775
Published in: Asian Journal of Sports Medicine: 10(3); e91775

Peer Review Report for "Two Sets of Dynamic Stretching of the Lower Body Musculature Improves Linear Repeated-Sprint Performance in Team-Sports."

Author(s): Asmadi Ishak, Hishamuddin Ahmad, Fui Yen Wong, Abdallah Rejeb, Hairul Anuar Hashim, Samuel Andrew Pullinger

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 22 Mar 2019
Revised Date: 9 Aug 2019
Accepted Date: 21 Aug 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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 6 Jun 2019

Dear EIC,
The present study aimed to examine the effect of different volumes of dynamic stretching on 30-m linear repeated-sprint performance in team-sport athletes. The authors concluded that a dynamic warm-up consisting of two sets resulted in improved performance in repeated-sprint.
The manuscript is well written and present interesting findings. However, some modifications and explanation are needed:
- Keywords. I suggest changing “set” and “repetition”
- Methods. I suggest adding the calculation of the sample size.
- Methods. I suggest adding a comment about the time of day of session. Indeed, it has been reported that stretching in the afternoon and the morning produces different results. For reference see Chtourou et al. (2013). Effect of static and dynamic stretching on the diurnal variations of jump performance in soccer players. PloS one, 8(8), e70534
- Methods. I suggest adding the calculation of the confidence interval in the statistical analysis (presented in the results).

- Results. Add the interpretation of the effect size.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 8 Jun 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 Reviewer,

We are extremely grateful for the informative comments and useful suggestions that have been provided which have helped us to improve our manuscript. We have taken all the comments and suggestions into account and provided answers in the revised version of our manuscript. We thank you for your input and would like to clarify the points you have kindly made below.

Reviewers' Comments:

The present study aimed to examine the effect of different volumes of dynamic stretching on 30-m linear repeated-sprint performance in team-sport athletes. The authors concluded that a dynamic warm-up consisting of two sets resulted in improved performance in repeated-sprint.

The manuscript is well written and present interesting findings. However, some modifications and explanation are needed:

Q 1: Keywords. I suggest changing “set” and “repetition”

A 1: The keywords set, and repetition has been taken out and replaced with the following:

Repeated accelerations

Q 2: Methods. I suggest adding the calculation of the sample size.

A 2: Thanks for your suggestion, we have added the calculation of sample size in the methods section within the statistical analysis Selection and Description of Participants:

Using statistical power software (G*Power v3.1.10, Germany), the sample size required for this study was estimated to be fourteen. This estimation was based on detecting a meaningful difference of 5% in repeated-sprint performance variables, a statistical power of 0.8 and an alpha level of 0.05 (Morris et al. 2009) between dynamic stretching conditions.

Q 3. Methods. I suggest adding a comment about the time of day of session. Indeed, it has been reported that stretching in the afternoon and the morning produces different results. For reference see Chtourou et al. (2013). Effect of static and dynamic stretching on the diurnal variations of jump performance in soccer players. PloS one, 8(8), e70534

A 3: Thanks for your suggestion, we have added more information regarding the time of day participants were tested.

The following has been added in the design section:

Minimum one week after the familiarisation process, each participant completed three experimental sessions counterbalanced in order of administration to minimise and statistically distribute any learning effects and conducted at the same time-of-day (from 7:00 to 11:00 h) to eliminate circadian influence on exercise performance, previously reported following stretching.

Q4: Methods. I suggest adding the calculation of the confidence interval in the statistical analysis (presented in the results).

A4: Thanks for your suggestions. We have added the appropriate information as to how the means were calculated:

Ninety-five percent confidence intervals are presented where appropriate and where corrected for between-subject differences. The approach involves the conceptualization of the trends over time for the "average person" by normalizing subject means and expressing all changes relative to the same mean.

Q5: Results. Add the interpretation of the effect size.

A5: Thanks for the comment. The interpretation of the effect size has been added in the results section according to the information in the statistical analysis. The magnitude of the ES was classified as trivial (>0.2), small (0.2-0.6), moderate (>0.6-1.2), large (>1.2-2.0) and very large (<2.0) as based on the guidelines from Batterham and Hopkins (43). For example:

(mean difference = 0.19 ± 0.06s, P=0.018, 95% CI: 0.03-0.35 s; ES=0.68, moderate)

(mean difference = 4.29 ± 0.94 s, P=0.002, 95% CI: 1.68-6.91 s; ES=1.51, large)

(mean difference = 1.83 ± 0.59 mmol/L^{-1}, P = 0.028, 95% CI: 0.19-3.47 mmol/L^{-1}; ES=0.59, small)

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) 5 Aug 2019

Dear EIC,
The authors have properly addressed the first comments. Only some minors modifications are needed:
- The references list should be verified : References 31, 45 and 46.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 9 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 (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 Associate Editor,

We have taken your comments and suggestions into account and revised our manuscript. We thank you for your input and would like to clarify the points you have kindly made below.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

The authors have properly addressed the first comments. Only some minors' modifications are needed:

The references list should be verified: References 31, 45 and 46.

Reference 31 has been changed to:

Pullinger SA, Bradley PS, Causer J, Ford PR, Newlove A, Patel K, Reid K, Robertson CM, Burniston JG, Doran DA, Waterhouse JM, Edwards B. Football-induced fatigue in hypoxia impairs repeated sprint ability and perceptual-cognitive skills. Science and Medicine in Football. 2019; 3: 221-230.

Reference 45 has been changed to:

Taylor JM, Weston M, Portas MD. The effect of a short practical warm-up protocol on repeated sprint performance. J Strength Cond Res. 2013;27(7):2034-2038.

Reference 46 has been changed to:

Wong PL, Lau PW, Mao DW, Wu YY, Behm DG, Wisløff U. Three days of static stretching within a warm-up does not affect repeated-sprint ability in youth soccer players. J Strength Cond Res. 2011;25(3):838-45.

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.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 21 Aug 2019

Dear Author,
The third 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.