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.92849
Published in: Asian Journal of Sports Medicine: 10(4); e92849

Peer Review Report for "The Effect of All-Extremity High-Intensity Interval Training on Plasma Pentraxin 3 in Young Overweight and Obese Women"

Author(s): Volga Hovsepian, Sayad Mohammad Marandi, Fahimeh Esfarjani, Reihaneh Zavar, Masoumeh Sadeghi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 3 May 2019
Revised Date: 28 Oct 2019
Accepted Date: 20 Nov 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)

4 Jun 2019

Dear AE,
Abstract:
1. design of the study needs to be mentioned.
2. Keywords: check the keywords according to MeSh terms.
3. Introduction: the introduction is not complete and needs to refer to the previous study. 4. There is no literature review for this part.
5. Method: only “BMI≥27kg.m” for inclusion criteria?
6. The research need to register in the “Iranian registry of clinical trials”
7. Need to mention clinical design or experimental design.
8. How did you choose and calculate sample size? And how did you do the sampling and randomization type? It is better to check with “CONSORT CHECKLIST REPORTING”
9. Blood analysis needs a reference.
10. Exercise protocol: warm-up and cooling down missing. The reference number 10 you mentioned is for the older adults, but your study on younger. Need to find the appropriate reference. How did you control the control group and what they did?
11. How did you increase the intensity of exercise? Is it according to Borg or so on?
Results:

1. The first part of the results better to put the table as characteristic of participants, age, weight, BMI.

Discussion:

1. The first paragraph of the discussion needs to be the main finding of results.
2. Conclusion needs to increase and add more regarding the study.

Reference

1. May this paper can help you

Ouerghi, N., Fradj, M. K. B., Bezrati, I., Khammassi, M., Feki, M., Kaabachi, N., & Bouassida, A. (2017). Effects of high-intensity interval training on body composition, aerobic and anaerobic performance, and plasma lipids in overweight/obese and normal-weight young men. Biology of sport, 34(4), 385.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 7 Jul 2019

Dear AE,

This manuscript needs a major revision.

1. Title: The effect of all extremity HIIT on plasma pentraxin3 in young overweight and obese women;
2. Relevant topic, nevertheless many points should be improved.
3. Please rewrite the article with a consult of a native English speaking partner, there are significant grammar points that need to be improved.

Methods

1. Please verify the logic of your sample size amount chosen.
2. Please give more information about the control group.
3. Please verify your randomization method.
4. Please explain the details you mentioned "Daily physical activity (step/day) assessed by pedometer (iHealth Edge, Inc. USA)"
5. Please give more details about your session" Intensity of training Increased gradually in three weeks to reach the target HR".
6. Please verify the method you detected vital signs during exercise sessions

Discussion

1. Please rewrite the discussion with the order of giving a brief summary of results, then comparing the finding with previous studies.
2. Please rewrite the article with a consult of a native English speaking partner, there are significant grammar points that need to be improved.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 10 Jul 2019

Dear EIC,

This manuscript shows considerable potential, as indicated by the reviewers' comments. The author may carefully address their comment, as indicated.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 12 Jul 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.

Response to reviewer 1:

Question1: Please rewrite the article with consult of a native English speaking partner, there are significant grammar points which need to be improved.

Response1: The article rewrite with consult of Kowsar English Edit Services,

Methods

*Question2***:** *Please verify the logic of your sample size amount chosen.*

Response 2: The sample size here is based on the FMD factor measured(1). This article is extracted from my dissertation where the primary outcome is the FMD factor, therefore the sample size of this article correspond to that of my thesis , while in this article the results are secondary outcome.

1. Madsen SM, Thorup AC, Overgaard K, Bjerre M, Jeppesen PB. Functional and structural vascular adaptations following 8 weeks of low volume high intensity interval training in lower leg of type 2 diabetes patients and individuals at high risk of metabolic syndrome. Archives of physiology and biochemistry. 2015;121(5):178-86.

*Question3***:** *Please give more information about the control group*

Response 3: the control group continued sedentary life style with no changes in diet and daily physical activity during the study controlled by questioner and NUT4 analyzer and pedometer.

*Question4***:** *Please verify your randomization method*

Response 4: The randomization of the article is subjected to coin tossing approach.

Question5: *Please explain the details you mentioned "Daily physical activity (step/day) assessed by pedometer (iHealth Edge, Inc. USA)"*

Response 5: As to the subject daily activity measurement during the intervention period, their daily physical activity were measured for three series, including two weekdays and one weekend. The obtained means thereof were compered within and between the groups. Further details are provided in the related section.

Question6: Please give more details about your session" Intensity of training "Increased gradually in three weeks to reach the target HR".

Response 6: According to gradually increase in exercise intensity principle the intensity of training was considered 65-70% HR max or RPE 12-13 in the first week, 70-75% HR max or RPE 13-14 in the second week, and 75-80% HR max or RPE 14-15 in the third week and 85-90% HR max or RPE 16-17 in the forth to tenth weeks.

Question 7: Please verify the method you detected vital signs during exercise sessions

Response 7: Heart rate monitored by pulse meter polar (model F4, Finland) continually during exercise training.

Discussion:

Question 8: Please rewrite discussion with the order of giving brief summary of results, then comparing the finding with previous studies.

Response 8: Well noted applied

Question 9: Please rewrite the article with consult of a native English speaking partner, there are significant grammar points which need to be improved.

Response 9: The article rewrite with consult of Kowsar English Edit Services

Responses to reviewer 2:

Question1: *Abstract: design of study need to mention*

Response1: cross-sectional semi-experimental study

Question2: *Keywords: check the keywords according MeSh terms*

Response2: Obesity, high-intensity interval training, pentraxin3

Introduction

Question3: *the introduction is not complete and need to refer previous study. There is no literature review for this part.*

Response 3: Well noted applied

Method:

Question4**:** *only "BMI≥27kg.m" for inclusion criteria?*

Response 4: healthy, sedentary, overweight and obese individuals with body mass index (BMI) ≥27kg.m $^{-2}$.were inclusion criteria

Question5: *The research need to register in "Iranian registry of clinical trials"*

Response 5: Because the design of this study is experimental not clinical, observance of IRCT is not relevant.

Question6: *Need to mention clinical design or experimental design.*

Response6: It was an experimental design

Question7: *How did you choose and calculate sample size?*

Response 7: The sample size here is based on the FMD factor measured(1). This article is extracted from my dissertation where the primary outcome is the FMD factor, therefore the sample size of this article correspond to that of my thesis , while in this article the results are secondary outcome.

1. Madsen SM, Thorup AC, Overgaard K, Bjerre M, Jeppesen PB. Functional and structural vascular adaptations following 8 weeks of low volume high intensity interval training in lower leg of type 2 diabetes patients and individuals at high risk of metabolic syndrome. Archives of physiology and biochemistry. 2015;121(5):178-86.

Question 8: how did you do the sampling and randomization type.

Response8: The randomization of the article is subjected to coin tossing approach.

Question 9: Blood analysis needs reference

Response 9: well noted applied.

Question 8: Exercise protocol: warm up and cooling down missing.

Response 10: Warm up and cool down, well noted applied.

Question 10: The reference number 10 you mentioned is for older adult, but your study on younger.

Response 10: Here the focus is on the exercise not the subjects' group age, because there exist no study regarding the age group here we had to refer to this source.

Question 11: How did you control the control group and what they did?

Response 11: The control group continued sedentary life style with no changes in diet and daily physical activity during the study, controlled by questioner and NUT4 analyzer and pedometer.

Question 12: How did you increase the intensity of exercise?

Response12: According to gradually increase in exercise intensity principle the intensity of training was considered 65-70% HR max or RPE 12-13 in the first week, 70-75% HR max or RPE 13-14 in the second week, and 75-80% HR max or RPE 14-15 in the third week and 85-90% HR max or RPE 16-17 in the forth to tenth weeks.

Results

Question13: The first part of results better to put table as characteristic of participants, age, weight, BMI

Response 13: Well noted applied

Discussion

Question 14: The first paragraph of discussion need to be main finding of results.

Response 14: Well noted applied

Question15: Conclusion need to increase and add more regarding study

Response 15: Well noted applied

Question 16: References

Response 16: According to home policy (authors' instructions) Asian j of sport medicine the references should be according to Vancouver style.

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) 6 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
There is some minor correction for this manuscript:
1. The word of HIIT needs to be in full name in the title.
"The effect of all extremity High-intensity interval training on plasma pentraxin3 in young overweight and obese women"
2. Add to more keywords
3. The introduction still not satisfactory, the literature review needs to be more clarify with the results of each study and then explain why this study.
4. In study design need to explain dependent and independent variables.
5. Strengths and limitations of the study should be before the conclusion.
Thanks.

Gregory A. Brown: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 8 Oct 2019

Dear EIC,
Please accept and apologize for the amount of time this manuscript has been in review. There were unexpected difficulties in obtaining timely comments from the reviewers.
This manuscript is intriguing in its topic, which is an evaluation of High-Intensity Interval Exercise and various biomarkers of health. Overall, the manuscript explains the background, methods, and results and discussion sufficiently. Appropriate sources are used as references and these sources are related to the current findings.
There are still a number of minor errors in English writing throughout the manuscript (i.e. "Pulse meter was applied for continuous monitoring of HR during training." "According to gradually increase in exercise intensity principle the intensity of training was considered 65-70% HR max or RPE" "Changes in these two variables are in line with each other and a longer period of training might cause better results in this regard.") These are just a few examples of the numerous English language errors.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 10 Oct 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.

Second revise:

Dear reviewer 1:

1: Title: "The effect of all extremity High-intensity interval training on plasma pentraxin3 in young overweight and obese women"

2: more key words were added

3: the introduction changed

4: In the study design explained dependent and independent variables

5: Strengths and limitations of the study wrote before conclusion

Dear Associate Editor 1: English writing was edited

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.

Gregory A. Brown: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 20 Nov 2019

Dear EIC,
The authors have addressed the concerns raised by the reviewers and have acceptably revised the manuscript.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 20 Nov 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.