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

Health Scope
Article DOI: 10.5812/jhealthscope.109478
Published in: Health Scope: 10(2); e109478

Peer Review Report for "Weight-Loss Parameters and Quality of Life in Obese Aged Women Using WATERinMOTION"

Author(s): Mohammadreza Rezaeipour, Gennady Leonidovich Apanasenko , Maryam Banparvari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 2 Oct 2020
Revised Date: 22 Feb 2021
Accepted Date: 15 Apr 2021

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)

1 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
Totally the present article is well-established and the subject is interesting, but some major revision should be considered.
- More suitable title should be selected for the article. The title should decrease to 10-12 words.
- The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results, and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.
- The necessity and innovation of the article should be presented in the introduction.
- The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clearly stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives at your debate or argument.
- It is suggested to add articles entitled “Paranjape and Singhania. Effect of Body Positions on Quadriceps Angle Measurement” and “Gamble and Crouse. Strategies for Supporting and Building Student Resilience in Canadian Secondary and Post-Secondary Educational Institutions” to the literature review.
- Sections and subsections should be numbered in order.

- It is suggested to present the structure of the article at the end of the introduction.
- More suitable title should be presented for table 1 instead of “The WATERinMOTION aquatics exercise program”.
- It is suggested to compare the results of the present research with some similar studies which is done before.
- Following, you will find some new related references which should be added to the literature review:
Baran et al. Body Fat Mass is Better Indicator than Indirect Measurement Methods in Obese Children for Fatty Liver and Metabolic Syndrome;
Lin An et al. GRIK3 rs490647 is a Common Genetic Variant between Personality and Subjective Well-being in Chinese Han Population.
- Page 8: the following paragraph is unclear, so please reorganize that:
“As well as, Rezaeipour and Nychyporuk (11) accomplished a 12-week plan, which comprised of an aquafit exercise (three-session a week) in postmenopausal females. They reported a significant reduction in weight loss parameters. However, Charmas and Gromisz (24) conducted swimming training, which lasted 12 weeks three times a week in young women, but no changes in weight were found.”
- Much more explanations and interpretations must be added for the results, which are not enough.
- Please make sure your conclusions' section underscores the scientific value-added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more detail. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value-added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.
- DOI of the references must be added (you can use “https://crossref.org/").
Thanks.

Alireza Dashipour: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 12 Dec 2020

Dear AE,
In abstract:
- In this sentence: "The WATERinMOTION program, without dietetical supervising, has a positive influence on the weight, waist circumference, and profiles of metabolic in elderly women with obesity. However, improving the quality of life should not be neglected."
The phrase " has a positive influence on the weight" is not scientific.
- Line 83-84, the sentence is not clear.
- The value of p-value must be mention
- How did the calculation of the dietary calorie pre and post-study?
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 26 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
Related to the article entitled: Influences of WATERinMOTION exercise program for weight reduction, metabolic profiles, and quality of life of elderly women with obesity.
About title:
- This title is prescribed: The effect of WATER in MOTION exercise on weight loss,

metabolic profiles and quality of life in obese elderly women
Abstract session:
Method part:
- Use of Anthropometric indices instead of “Anthropometric measurements”
- It is so better to determine the name of two groups exactly. like case and control groups.
Result part;
- In the English language writing point of view is too weak.
Conclusion part:
- This sentence is suggested
The result of the current study has shown that the WATERinMOTION program, without diet, has a positive effect on weight loss, waist circumference, and metabolic profiles in obese elderly women.
Keyword part
- On the basis of the ambition of the study, the following keywords are recommended;
Keywords: Water Sports, anthropometric indices, metabolic profiles, Quality of Life, obese women
Running title part
- This running title is prescribed: Water Sports & weight loss
Background section
- It is much better to put the result of related surveys in this section deeply.
Materials and Methods section:
- It is so better to determine the name of two groups exactly. Like case and control groups.
- Please mention the year of the study.
What did the researchers do “with mortality obesity women”. Did they exclude the study? Please mention this issue in the body of this section.
- Did the participant checked in the “audiometer viewpoint” before the study? This is so important.
- Please mention this related age disease in the exclusion criteria exactly.
Discussion section
- If it is possible, it is so good to put some comments on obtained results in this section
Final decision.
It is Ok for publishing
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 26 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.
Kind regards,

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (0) 29 Jan 2021

Dear Author
According to reviewer comments, the manuscript need “Major revision”.
Best Regards

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.

REVIEWER RESPONSE LETTER

Dear Referee No.1,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the manuscript. Your suggestions are immensely helpful and are appreciated. The changes are marked with the highlight color in the revised manuscript.

Reviewer 1:

-Totally the present article is well-established and the subject is interesting, but some major revision should be considered.

Response: Thanks again for your kind opinion. Your comments were included immediately after this letter and have been responded to them, exactly shown how each concern or problem was solved and has been explained the changes made.

- More suitable title should be selected for the article. Title should decrease to 10-12 words.

Response: The reviewer's suggestion about the title was followed up and modified in the revised manuscript.

- The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.

Response: The reviewer's suggestion was followed up and the abstract of the manuscript has now been rewritten to more clarity.

- The necessity and innovation of the article should be presented to the introduction.

Response: According to the reviewer's suggestion, some parts of the introduction have now been rewritten for greater transparency as the second paragraph.

- The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

Response: Some parts of the first, second and third paragraphs have been rewritten about the necessity and logic of this study. It was mentioned that despite numerous studies done in the field of water sports, and five references were mentioned, there is still controversy in this regard. In addition, the word limitation of the manuscript must be considered. The results of this study may help clarify some aspects of this sport.

- It is suggested to add articles entitled “Paranjape and Singhania. Effect of Body Positions on Quadriceps Angle Measurement” and “Gamble and Crouse. Strategies for Supporting and Building Student Resilience in Canadian Secondary and Post-Secondary Educational Institutions” to the literature review.

Response: These resources have now been added to the revised manuscript.

- Sections and sub-sections should be numbered in order.

Response: Corrected.

- It is suggested to present the structure of the article at the end of the introduction.

Response: Thank you for your suggestion, in response to your comment, Figure 1 has now been added to the revised manuscript.

- More suitable title should be presented for the table 1 instead of “The WATERinMOTION aquatics exercise program”.

Response: Changed.

- It is suggested to compare the results of the present research with some similar studies which is done before.

Response: The background and discussion sections in this regard were rewritten.

- Following, you will find some new related references which should be added to literature review:

Baran et al. Body Fat Mass is Better Indicator than Indirect Measurement Methods in Obese Children for Fatty Liver and Metabolic Syndrome;

Lin An et al. GRIK3 rs490647 is a Common Genetic Variant between Personality and Subjective Well-being in Chinese Han Population.

Response: Added.

- Page 8: the following paragraph is unclear, so please reorganize that:

“As well as, Rezaeipour and Nychyporuk (11) accomplished a 12-week plan, which comprised of an aquafit exercise (three-session a week) in postmenopausal females. They reported a significant reduction in weight loss parameters. However, Charmas and Gromisz (24) conducted swimming training, which lasted 12 weeks with three times a week in young women, but no changes in weight were found.”

Response: Rewritten.

- Much more explanations and interpretations must be added for the results, which are not enough.

Response: The reviewer's suggestions were followed and more data and explanations have now been added in the results section and Table 2.

- Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

Response: Revised.

- DOI of the references must be added (you can use “https://crossref.org/").

Response: Added.

We acknowledge the reviewer's comment and suggestion very much, which are valuable in improving the quality of our manuscript.

Best Regards

Dear Referee No.2,

We greatly appreciate your thoughtful comments that have helped to improve the manuscript. We trust that all of your comments have been addressed accordingly in a revised manuscript. In the following, we give a point-by-point reply to your comments. The highlight color has been used to show the location of corrections in the manuscript.

Reviewer 2:

Dear Editor in chief,

Related to the article with entitled: Influences of WATERinMOTION exercise program for weightreduction, metabolic profiles and quality of life of elderly women with obesity.

About title:

This title is prescribed : The effect of WATER in MOTION exercise on weight loss, metabolic profiles and quality of life in obese elderly women

Response: Thank you for your comment. But, based on the summing up of the comments of all reviewers, and also taking into account the fact that the title should be reduced to 10 - 12 words; Therefore, the title was changed in the revised manuscript accordingly.

Abstract session:

Method part:

- Use of Anthropometric indices instead of "Anthropometric measurements"

Response: Changed.

- It is so better to determine the name of two groups exactly . like case and control groups.

Response: Modified.

Result part;

- In the English language writing point of view is too weak.

Response: Rewritten to improve English.

Conclusion part:

This sentence is suggested

The result of current study has shown that the WATERinMOTION program, without diet, has a positive effect on the weight loss, waist circumference, and metabolic profiles in obese elderly women.

Response: Changed.

Key word part

On the basis of ambition of the study, the following key words are recommended;

Key words: Water Sports, anthropometric indices, metabolic profiles, Quality of Life, obese women

Response: Thanks, some of the keywords that exist in MeSH Browser were now added to the revised manuscript.

Running title part

This running title is prescribed: Water Sports & weight loss

Response: Changed.

Background section

It is much better to put the result of related surveys in this section deeply.

Response: The reviewer's suggestion was followed up and further explanations in various related fields have now added in the revised version.

Materials and Methods section:

- It is so better to determine the name of two groups exactly. Like case and control groups.

Response: Modified.

- Please mention to the year of the study.

Response: Corrected.

What did the researches do “with mortality obesity women”. Did they exclude of the study? Please mention to this issue in the body of this section.

Response: We did not limit ourselves to the obesity class, because, as described in the exclusion criteria, all women who had a medical ban from participating in WATERinMOTION were excluded.

- Did the participant checked in the “audiometer viewpoint” before the study? This is so important.

Response: Thanks for the kind advice, the reply to your comment has now been added to the revised manuscript. The research team has assessed the various aspects of participants' health that were included in the exclusion criteria. The existence of hearing loss that interferes with

listening to sports music was one of them because hearing sports music is a requirement of this water sport.

- Please mention to this related age disease in exclusion criteria exactly.

Response: More explanations are now added in the revised manuscript.

Discussion section

If it is possible, it is so good to put some comments on obtained results in this section

Response: The revised version has now been revised as much as possible, particularly in the discussion conclusion section.

Final decision.

It is Ok for publishing

Response: Thank you so much for your kind opinion and the opportunity to review the manuscript.

We acknowledge the reviewer's comment and suggestion very much, which are valuable in improving the quality of our manuscript.

Best Regards

Dear Referee No.3,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the manuscript. Your suggestions are extremely useful and valued. The changes are marked with the highlight color in the revised manuscript.

Reviewer 3:

In abstract:

- In this sentence : "The WATERinMOTION program, without dietetical supervising, has a positive influence on the weight, waist circumference, and profiles of metabolic in elderly women with obesity. However, improving the quality of life should not be neglected."

The phrase " has a positive influence on the weight" is not scientific.

Response: Please, let us disagree with you. These terms (e.g. positive influence or positive effect) have been used in many sources, such as the following, to refer to an improved effect that has not been significant:

1. Kyeongho Byun, Kazuki Hyodo, Kazuya Suwabe, Genta Ochi, Yosuke Sakairi, Morimasa Kato, Ippeita Dan, Hideaki Soya, Positive effect of acute mild exercise on executive function via arousal-related prefrontal activations: An fNIRS study, NeuroImage. 2014; **98**:336-345,

2. Rezaeipour M, Apanasenko GL. Effects of Waterobics Programs on Body Mass, Body Composition, and Coronary Risk Profile of Sedentary Obese Middle-aged Women. *Women's Health Bulletin*. 2019;**6**(4):13-7.

- Line 83-84, the sentence is not clear.

Response: Thanks for the kind advice, the reply to your comment has now been rewritten into the revised manuscript.

- The value of p-value must be mention

Response: Added.

- How did calculation of the dietary calorie pre and post study?

Response: The reviewer's suggestion followed up and more explanations have now been added to the last paragraph of 3.1 and also Table 2.

We acknowledge the reviewer's comment and suggestion very much, which are valuable in improving the quality of our manuscript.

Best Regards

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

Below are the honorable reviewers comments:

Response:

Dear Associate Editor 1,

Thank you very much for your letter and the opportunity to review the manuscript. What has been described below as the views of the referees is a repetition of the items answered above one-by-one.

Best Regards

Reviewer 1:

In abstract:

- In this sentence : "The WATERinMOTION program, without dietetical supervising, has a positive influence on the weight, waist circumference, and profiles of metabolic in elderly women with obesity. However, improving the quality of life should not be neglected."

The phrase " has a positive influence on the weight" is not scientific.

- Line 83-84, the sentence is not clear.

- The value of p-value must be mention

- How did calculation of the dietary calorie pre and post study?

Reviewer 2:

some major revision should be considered:

- More suitable title should be selected for the article. Title should decrease to 10-12 words.

- The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.

- The necessity and innovation of the article should be presented to the introduction.

- The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

- It is suggested to add articles entitled “Paranjape and Singhania. Effect of Body Positions on Quadriceps Angle Measurement” and “Gamble and Crouse. Strategies for Supporting and Building Student Resilience in Canadian Secondary and Post-Secondary Educational Institutions” to the literature review.

- Sections and sub-sections should be numbered in order.

- It is suggested to present the structure of the article at the end of the introduction.

- More suitable title should be presented for the table 1 instead of “The WATERinMOTION aquatics exercise program”.

- It is suggested to compare the results of the present research with some similar studies which is done before.

- Following, you will find some new related references which should be added to literature review:

Baran et al. Body Fat Mass is Better Indicator than Indirect Measurement Methods in Obese Children for Fatty Liver and Metabolic Syndrome;

Lin An et al. GRIK3 rs490647 is a Common Genetic Variant between Personality and Subjective Well-being in Chinese Han Population.

- Page 8: the following paragraph is unclear, so please reorganize that:

“As well as, Rezaeipour and Nychyporuk (11) accomplished a 12-week plan, which comprised of an aquafit exercise (three-session a week) in postmenopausal females. They reported a significant reduction in weight loss parameters. However, Charmas and Gromisz

(24) conducted swimming training, which lasted 12 weeks with three times a week in young women, but no changes in weight were found.”

- Much more explanations and interpretations must be added for the results, which are not enough.

- Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

- DOI of the references must be added (you can use “https://crossref.org/").

Reviewer 3:

About title:

This title is prescribed : The effect of WATER in MOTION exercise on weight loss, metabolic profiles and quality of life in obese elderly women

Abstract session:

Method:

- Use of Anthropometric indices instead of “Anthropometric measurements”

- It is so better to determine the name of two groups exactly . like case and control groups.

Result;

- In the English language writing point of view is too weak.

Conclusion:

This sentence is suggested

The result of current study has shown that the WATERinMOTION program, without diet, has a positive effect on the weight loss, waist circumference, and metabolic profiles in obese elderly women.

Key words:

On the basis of ambition of the study, the following key words are recommended;

Key words: Water Sports, anthropometric indices, metabolic profiles, Quality of Life, obese women

Running title:

This running title is prescribed: Water Sports & weight loss

Background:

It is much better to put the result of related surveys in this section deeply.

Materials and Methods:

- It is so better to determine the name of two groups exactly. Like case and control groups.

- Please mention to the year of the study.

What did the researches do “with mortality obesity women”. Did they exclude of the study? Please mention to this issue in the body of this section.

- Did the participant checked in the “audiometer viewpoint” before the study? This is so important.

- Please mention to this related age disease in exclusion criteria exactly.

Discussion:

If it is possible, it is so good to put some comments on obtained results in this section

EIC Decision:

Dear Author

According to reviewer comments, the manuscript need “Major revision”.

Best Regards

Response: We followed the editor in chief suggestions and the manuscript has been carefully revised. All Comments indicated above are in the revised manuscript.

Best Regards

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) — 1 Mar 2021

Dear AE,
The authors have successfully addressed the reviewer comments. Well done. Several points to consider to improve the quality of this paper.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 11 Apr 2021

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 15 Apr 2021

Dear Author
Your article has been accepted for publication.
Best regards