Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies
Volume 12 · Issue 2 · e153379

OPEN PEER REVIEW

The Effect of Hopping Trainings on the Static and Dynamic Balance of Iraqi Deaf Athletes: A Semi-experimental Study

Abouzar Saadatian, Mahmoud Abdulsalam Hossein, Ayoub Hashemi, Elahe Siavashi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
10 Aug 2024	16 Oct 2024	9 Nov 2024	10.5812/mejrh-153379

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Editor-in-Chief 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 8

1 Original submission

3 comments · 31 Aug 2024 – 5 Oct 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 31 Aug 2024

Introduction

• The final paragraph, which discusses the characteristics of the hopping training, should include appropriate references. It's also important to cite studies that have employed these exercises, along with their outcomes, to assess the quantity and quality of research in this field.

Method

• The study is not classified as quasi-experimental because it includes both a control group and randomization, making it a randomized clinical trial.

• The sample size should be detailed, including the specific variable on which it was based, the study from which the data were derived, the effect size, alpha level, power values, and the type of design selected in the software.

• Isn't the convenience sampling method non-random? Therefore, remove the phrase 'all deaf athletes' from both the methodology and the abstract sections of the article.

• Include a discussion on blinding and randomization in the methodology.

• Add a CONSORT flowchart.

• How is the total score determined in the Y balance test?

• Specify the treatment the control group received and include relevant details.

• Remove any repeated sentences in the method section to avoid redundancy.

• Add references for the hopping training method.

• The statistics section requires revision. It should be clarified that an independent t-test was employed to compare demographic characteristics between groups. The effect of the intervention was assessed using ANCOVA, while a repeated-measures ANOVA test was utilized to examine the effect of time within the groups. Additionally, specify the criterion used for effect size and how it was interpreted.

• Organize the results into three distinct sections: demographic characteristics, static balance, and dynamic balance.

• In the sentence “The results of the independent t-test did not show any significant difference in the mean of the research variables (P>0.05)”, write demographic characteristics instead of research variables.

• Tables need revision. In Table 3, include the mean and standard deviation before and after in separate columns. Instead of writing the difference before and after, write the mean differences and add a confidence section. The effect size should also be included. In Table 4, delete the four columns that include “Source of Change”, “sum of Squares”, “DF”, and “average of squares”.

Discussion

• Compare your results with other studies.

• Add related references. Some key sentences are missing references.

• The text contains numerous spelling and grammar issues that need to be corrected.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 2 Oct 2024

Dear Authors

The introduction requires a clear rationale for applying this training method to improve balance.

The sample size calculation and the primary outcome should be indicated. The type of study should be reconsidered.

Editor-in-Chief MAJOR REVISION 5 Oct 2024

Dear Authors
According to the reviewers' and associate editor's comments, your article requires major revision. When revising your manuscript, please consider all issues mentioned in the reviewers' comments carefully: please outline every change made in response to their comments and submit the required files.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear reviewers, we appreciate and thank you for your comments and suggestions.

Below, are the justifications for each question.

All suggestions were added to the manuscript and highlighted in yellow

Reviewer 1:

Introduction

• The final paragraph, which discusses the characteristics of the hopping trainings, should include appropriate references. It's also important to cite studies that have employed these exercises, along with their outcomes, to assess the quantity and quality of research in this field.

RESPONSE: It was corrected.

Method

• The study is not classified as quasi-experimental because it includes both a control group and randomization, making it a randomized clinical trial.

RESPONSE: The sampling in the study was a convenience sample and randomly assigned the participants into an experimental and control group. Other features of the randomized clinical trial, such as blinding, were not used in this study. Thus, the type of research conducted is quasi-experimental.

• The sample size should be detailed, including the specific variable that determined the basis, the study from which the data was derived, the effect size, alpha level, power values, and the type of design selected in the software.

RESPONSE: The information was included in the manuscript

• Isn't the sampling method of convenience non-random? Therefore, remove the phrase 'all deaf athletes' from both the methodology and the abstract sections of the article.

RESPONSE: All deaf athletes in the city of Baghdad were considered the statistical population. The sample was selected through convenience sampling, based on the results from G*Power software.

• Include a discussion on blinding and randomization in the methodology.

RESPONSE: Since this study is quasi-experimental, we did not use blinding.

• Add a CONSORT flowchart.

RESPONSE: The CONSORT flowchart was drawn and added to the manuscript.

• How is the total score determined in the Y balance test?

RESPONSE: The information was included in the manuscript

• Specify the treatment the control group received and include relevant details.

RESPONSE: The information was included in the manuscript

• Remove any repeated sentences in the method section to avoid redundancy.

RESPONSE: repeated sentences removed in the method section

• Add references for the hopping training method.

RESPONSE: The references were added to the manuscript.

Results

• The statistics section requires revision. It should be clarified that an independent t-test was employed to compare demographic characteristics between groups. The effect of the intervention was assessed using ANCOVA, while a repeated-measures ANOVA test was utilized to examine the effect of time within the groups. Additionally, specify the criterion used for effect size and how it was interpreted.

RESPONSE: The statistical analysis section was revised.

• Organize the results into three distinct sections: demographic characteristics, static balance, and dynamic balance.

RESPONSE: The results were organized into three distinct sections.

• In this sentence “The results of the independent t-test did not show any significant difference in the mean of the research variables (P>0.05)”, write demographic characteristics instead of research variables.

RESPONSE: Changes applied.

• Tables need revision. In Table 3, include the mean and standard deviation before and after in separate columns. Instead of writing the difference before and after, write the mean differences and add a confidence section. The effect size should also be included. In Table 4, delete the four columns that include the “Source of Change”, “sum of Squares”, “DF”, and “average of squares”.

RESPONSE: Changes applied.

Discussion

• Compare your results with other studies.

RESPONSE: Changes applied.

• Add related references. Some key sentences are missing references.

RESPONSE: Changes applied.

• The text contains numerous spelling and grammar issues that need to be revised.

RESPONSE: Changes applied.

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 30 Oct 2024 – 9 Nov 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 30 Oct 2024

I thank the authors. The comments have been addressed well.

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 9 Nov 2024

Dear Authors
We are pleased to inform you that your article is accepted for publication in the MEJRHS. We hope to receive other suitable articles from your group.