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

Journal of Archives in Military Medicine
Article DOI: 10.5812/jamm.98209
Published in: Journal of Archives in Military Medicine: 7(3); e98209

Peer Review Report for "The Effect of High-Intensity Interval Training on Liver Enzymes in Active and Inactive Women"

Author(s): Asiye Seyyed, Hadis Ghajari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 18 Sep 2019
Revised Date: 22 Sep 2019
Accepted Date: 23 Oct 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)

28 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
The study compared four groups of young females (10 ea) for the influence of HIIT on liver enzymes. To improve the manuscript note the following items:
1) How did the author select individuals within the groups? It does not seem to be randomized. The active groups had greater weight and loos to intentionally selected to be in the active groups. State your method.
2) They might add values of changes in the result section of the abstract beside the P-values.
3) Despite the statement, only 20% of NAFLD have increased liver function tests. LFTs are not surrogate markers for NAFLD. Therefore they can extrapolate the results only to LFT not directly to NAFLD.
Look at Dyson JK, Anstee QM, McPherson S. Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease: a practical approach to diagnosis and staging Frontline Gastroenterology 2014;5:211-218.
4) They should revise the conclusion based on the above note.
5) They should add P-value to table 1.
6) They must clearly state inclusion and exclusion criteria. Exclusion must cover all limiting factors for exercise and potential diseases that may have an impact on the results.
7) They should change the order of pre and post in the figures from left to right, first pre

then post.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 28 Sep 2019

Dear EIC,
The author should correct the manuscript based on the comments by reviewers. Additionally, regarding the figures, says what do the error bars stand for.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 28 Sep 2019

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
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-in-Chief

Thank you for your kind attention to my article in tittle "**The Effect of High Intensity Interval Training (HIIT) on Liver Enzymes in Active and Inactive Women**" first, reforms of reviewers was respected in the article by red color and they listed below.

Reviewer 1

1. In methods section selection of subjects introduced also it should be noted that the sampling was purposively and as we noted in results there were no significant differences between weights of research groups in pre- test.
2. As reviewer noted the mean changes added to p- value in results section of abstract.
3. Conclusion corrected as reviewer noted.
4. P-value of Table1 added in separate column.
5. Inclusion and exclusion criteria corrected according to comments of reviewer.
6. Order of pre and post in all figures corrected from left to right.

Associate Editor 1

1. Manuscript corrected based on the comments by reviewers.
2. Bellow the figures noted that all findings are based on mean and SD (error bars stand for SD).

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: EIC | **Revision (1)** 23 Oct 2019

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.