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.96743
Published in: Asian Journal of Sports Medicine: 11(1); e96743

Peer Review Report for "Association of Hamstring Strain Injuries with Season and Temperature in Track and Field Collegiate Athletes in Japan: A Descriptive Epidemiological Study"

Author(s): Gaku Tokutake, Rieko Kuramochi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 30 Jul 2019
Revised Date: 13 Dec 2019
Accepted Date: 19 Jan 2020

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)

13 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
The article is well written with acceptable English except few places. Following is one example.
"A previous study on the incidence of his among Australian footballers reported that six of the 20 enrolled subjects sustained HSI over two years".
- Discussion is mainly descriptive and qualitative and although acceptable to some extent in epidemiological studies, needs some revisiting to address the STATISTICAL analyses that support the ASSOCIATIONS. Having a cold weather and incidence of injury can simply be a coincidence rather than association unless supported by appropriate statistical analysis.
- Generalizing the results to JAPAN can not be appropriate considering the study population features.
Thanks.

Noureddin Nakhostin Ansari: Associate Editor | Revision (0)

30 Nov 2019

Dear EIC,

Authors should consider language checking of this manuscript for minor errors. Further statistical analysis for evaluating the relationship between cold and incidence of injuries is required. The Discussion should focus mainly on the interpretation of results.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 30 Nov 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.
Please consider the following comments in the new version of your paper:
- Abstract word count less than 250 words.
- The most reference used in this article is before 2012. Please consider updating the references.
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.

[12/10/2019]

Dr. Vahid Ziaee,
Editor-in-chief
Asian Journal of Sports Medicine

Manuscript ID: 96743

Dear Dr. Vahid Ziaee,

Thank you very much for your review of the manuscript (ID: 96743). We thank the Reviewer and Associate Editor for providing constructive comments for improvement of the original manuscript. We have carried out the required additional statistical analysis to address the Reviewer's major criticism.

We are attaching a revised manuscript. All changes made in response to the Reviewer's suggestion, and itemized responses to the Reviewer's comments are also attached.

Reviewer # 1:

Q1: The article is well written with acceptable English except few places. Following is one example. "A previous study on the incidence of his among Australian footballers reported that six of the 20 enrolled subjects sustained HSI over two years".

A1: We have had native English speakers proofread our manuscript. Also, we have amended the error highlighted by the Reviewer.

Q2: Discussion is mainly descriptive and qualitative and although acceptable to some extent in epidemiological studies, need some revisiting to address the STATISTICAL analyses that support the ASSOCIATIONS. Having a cold weather and incidence of injury can simply be a coincidence rather than association unless supported by appropriate statistical analysis.

A2: We appreciate the helpful suggestion of Reviewer 1. We have conducted additional statistical analyses that support the associations. The temperature data on the injury day may be influenced by the variations in the training program among seasons. Therefore, in order to exclude such effects, we randomly selected the same number of control days from the same season as the injury days and compared the temperatures of the injury and control days; there was no significant difference between the two groups. This result means that small temperature changes in the same season may not affect the occurrence of hamstring strain injury. We wanted to examine the effect of temperature to the occurrence of this injury in a more direct manner. However, due to the lack of data on training programs and the difficulty in comparing the temperature data, we were unable to compare the relationship between temperature and occurrence of the injury directly. Therefore, we have described this point in the Discussion as a limitation of the study.

Q3: Generalizing the results to JAPAN can not be appropriate considering the study population features.

A3: We agree with the point-of-view of Reviewer 1. We have described this issue in the Discussion as a limitation of the study.

We believe that we have addressed the Reviewer’s comments and hope that the revised manuscript is now acceptable publication in the *Asian Journal of Sports Medicine*. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

The corresponding author

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.

Noureddin Nakhostin Ansari: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 18 Jan 2020

Dear EIC,
The authors have addressed the concerns in the revised manuscript. It now looks good to be accepted for publication.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 19 Jan 2020

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.