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://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/mejrh.106789
Published in: Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies: 8(1); e106789

Peer Review Report for "Effect of Different Types of Lower-Limb Exercise on Blood Pressure in Hypertensive People: A Randomized, Double-blind Controlled Clinical Trial"

Author(s): Rozita Hedayati, Salimeh Mahmoodi, Rasool Bagheri, Marjan Biglary , Amir Hoshang Bakhtiary, Majid Mirmohammadkhani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	24 Jun 2020
Revised Date:	28 Nov 2020
Accepted Date:	29 Nov 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) 3 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
my comments to the authors:
- How long did hypertension last in the subjects? Due to the high age range of the participants, it seems that the severity of the hypertension was not homogeneous and this may be one of the reasons for not observing the difference between the three groups.
- Were participants categorized by hypertension stage? Please verify the stages of hypertension of participants.
- Please include the baseline variables of BMI, and blood pressures of participants in a table.
- What medications were participants currently taking to control their blood pressure? Please point
- Was the Holter monitoring performed by a cardiologist? Please explain
- The intensity of exercise according to its oxygen consumption is the most important

indicator for the effectiveness of exercise. Was the intensity of these exercises controlled?
- At the top of the tables, there is a cross, but it is not clear which columns are compared.
- Few articles can be found that do not report at least a difference between eccentric and other exercises and blood pressure and oxygen consumption. In the discussion, this article only mentions the findings of other researches without stating the reason for the different results of the present study. Why you didn't find any differences in the three experimental groups? Apart from other researchers.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 11 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
- The introduction is too long.
- In the introduction section, lines 72-74, the stated purpose does not correspond to the original title and purpose of the study.
- What was the sample size selection based upon?
- As many studies have proven the effects of exercise on study variables, what is the novelty of this study?
- What are the inclusion and exclusion criteria? In this study, the exclusion criteria are very important (such as pulmonary or cardiac disease or diabetes and etc).
- What is the ethical and IRCT number?
- In the discussion section, there is no physiological explanation is given for the lack of difference between the three groups.
- While in previous studies the effect of eccentric exercises has been more effective than the others, why in this study no difference was observed between the groups?
- The author needs to explain the details of other studies such as sample size, the intervention method, the variables of the study, and the results. Then compare the results of the present study with others.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 12 Jul 2020

Dea EIC,
Based on the reviewer's comments, the article needs major revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 12 Jul 2020

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.
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 reviewers: MEJRH-R1 entitled " **The effect of different types of lower-limb exercise on blood pressure in hypertensive people**"

I am very much thankful to the reviewers for their deep and thorough review. I have revised my present research paper in the light of their useful suggestions and comments. I hope my revision has improved the paper to a level of their satisfaction. Number wise answers to their specific comments/suggestions/queries are as follows.

Reviewer 1:
There are some grammatical errors in the manuscript.

Response: with many thanks, a grammar check is carried out throughout the manuscript.

The introduction is too long. In the introduction section, lines 72-74, the stated purpose does not correspond to the original title and purpose of the study.

Response: with many thanks, introduction is revised and summarized. Study objectives are revised according to your valuable comment.

What was the sample size selection based upon?

Response: with many thanks, sample size calculation is added to this section.

As many studies have proven the effects of exercise on study variables, what is the novelty of this study?

Response: with many thanks, as stated in the introduction, previous studies have not evaluated comparison between concentric and eccentric exercise. Moreover, our study is the only study using a treadmill in completely controlled conditions provide eccentric and concentric exercises for the subjects and at the same time, we examined the cardiopulmonary conditions together.

What are the inclusion and exclusion criteria? In this study the exclusion criteria is very important (such as pulmonary or cardiac disease or diabetes and etc).

Response: Inclusion and exclusion criteria are described in lines 91-96.

What is the ethical and IRCT number?

Response: with many thanks, the ethical and IRCT number are specified in lines 80-81.

In the discussion section, there is no physiological explanation is given for the lack of difference between the three groups.

Response: with many thanks, discussion is revised according to your comment.

While in previous studies the effect of eccentric exercises has been more effective than the others, why in this study no difference was observed between the groups?

Response: with many thanks, this issue is stated in the revised manuscript according to your comment.

The author needs to explain the details of other studies such as sample size, the intervention method, the variables of study and the results. Then compare the results of present study with others.

Response: with many thanks, some sentences are added to this section.

Reviewer 2:
How long did the hypertension last in the subjects? Due to the high age range of the participants, it seems that the severity of the hypertension was not homogeneous and this may be one of the reasons for not observing the difference between the three groups.

Response: This study evaluated 45 participants with chronic hypertension (5 ± 1 year). This sentence is added in the results section.

Were participants categorized by hypertension stage? Please verify the stages of hypertension of participants.

Response: with many thanks, participants were categorized in stage 1 hypertension to include the study.

Please include the baseline variables of BMI, and blood pressures of participants in a table.

Response: with many thanks, baseline variables are included in the table 1.

What medications were participants currently taking to control their blood pressure? Please point

Response: as stated in the manuscript in the line 111, they were currently taking their drugs as in pre intervention state.

Was the Holter monitoring performed by a cardiologist? Please explain

Response: Holter monitoring was performed both by cardiologist (Dr. Marjan Biglary) and physiotherapist (Mrs Salimeh Mahmoodi who trained in this field) throughout the study.

The intensity of exercise according to its oxygen consumption is the most important indicator for the effectiveness of exercise. Was the intensity of these exercises controlled?

Response: intensity of exercise was controlled using their maximum heart rate and VO2max. These sentences are added and highlighted in the manuscript in lines 127-134.

At the top of the tables there is a cross, but it is not clear which columns are compared.

Response: all figures are replaced with tables 2and 3 for better representation of mean and standard deviation of study variables.

Few articles can be found that do not report at least a difference between eccentric and other exercises and blood pressure and oxygen consumption. In the discussion, this article only mentions the findings of other researches without stating the reason for the different results of the present study. Why you didn't find any differences in three experimental groups? Apart from other researchers.

Response: with many thanks, after revising the results section, we notice an error in reporting the result of between group, therefore the tables is added in the revised manuscript and the discussion is revised accordingly.

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) — 4 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
The authors replied to the comments. The manuscript can be published.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 8 Nov 2020

Dear EIC,
Since both the reviewers of this article, Dr. Safavi and Dr. Aminian, accepted the authors' corrections, the article can be published as accepted.
Thanks.

Fatemeh Ehsani: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 9 Nov 2020

Dear Authors
Some corrections are still needed to accept your article.
- Please cite the sentences of whole manuscript to related references, especially in the introduction section.
- You acclaim your study is a double-blinded clinical trial, but this issue is not clear in the study. Please explain clearly the blinding producer in the method section of this study.
-Tables 1 and 2 are not stated in the manuscript, while you noted only the tables 3-5 in the result section.
-Please add the inclusion and exclusion criteria in the manuscript and delete the table 1.
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.

Response to reviewers: MEJRH-R1 entitled " **The effect of different types of lower-limb exercise on blood pressure in hypertensive people**"
I am very much thankful to the reviewers for their deep and thorough review. I have revised my present research paper in the light of their useful suggestions and comments. I hope my revision has improved the paper to a level of their satisfaction. Number wise answers to their specific comments/suggestions/queries are as follows.

EIC Decision:

Dear Authors
Some corrections are still needed to accept your article.
- Please cite the sentences of whole manuscript to related references, especially in the introduction section.

Response: With many thanks, all parts of the manuscript are re-worked for the citation of the sentences.
- You acclaim your study is a double-blinded clinical trial, but this issue is not clear in the study. Please explain clearly the blinding producer in the method section of this study.

Response: with many thanks, blinding is explained in the methods section based on your valuable comment.

-Tables 1 and 2 are not stated in the manuscript, while you noted only the tables 3-5 in the result section.

Response: with many thanks, all tables are stated in the manuscript. Correction has made in the revised manuscript.

-Please add the inclusion and exclusion criteria in the manuscript and delete the table 1.

Response: with many thanks, table 1 has been deleted from the manuscript, and the inclusion and exclusion criteria are added in the method section.

Best regards.

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.

Fatemeh Ehsani: EIC | **Revision** (2) 29 Nov 2020

Dear Authors,
I am pleased to inform you that your article is accepted for publication in this journal.
Thanks.