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

Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences
Article DOI: 10.5812/zjrms.92708
Published in: Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences: 22(1); e92708

Peer Review Report for "The Effects of 8 Weeks Pilates, Walking, and Combined Pilates and Walking on Heart Arrhythmia"

Author(s): Shahla Hoseini Niya, Majid Vahidian-Rezazadeh, Hadi Heidari Mokarrar

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 29 Apr 2019
Revised Date: 21 Jul 2019
Accepted Date: 30 Jul 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) — 6 May 2019

Dear AE,
The manuscript is accepted with some minor revisions. I feel the authors made a result before doing any research please their it in your abstract.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 3 Jun 2019

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,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 3 Jun 2019

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.

Dr. Akbari

Reviewer: Cardiovascular arrhythmia is not correct, because cardiovascular is a complex system include heart and vessels, please replace with Heart Arrhythmia.
Author: Cardiovascular arrhythmia replaced with Heart Arrhythmia.

Reviewer: Materials and Methods

Author: The word was corrected.

Reviewer: please write complete rephrase: ECG/ANOVA/SPSS/RHR

Author: We wrote Rephrases completely.

Reviewer: Findings

Author: Instead of the word "finding", we wrote the "Results".

Reviewer: corrected form is $p<0.001$

Author: We corrected all the P-values in the abstract.

Reviewer: According to the results, indicate which of type has reduced role in comparison with the other.

Author: We did the reviewer's reminder. According to the results, we compared the groups with each other.

Reviewer: What has been the definition of tachycardia?
Author: We thoroughly explained the term "Tachycardia" in the text.

Reviewer: How long after exercise?
Author: The protocol is fully explained in the text.

Reviewer: The first. 4th and 8th week's data should be provided (Mean +- SEM).
This type of data representation is not appropriate.
Author: According to the reviewer, we have changed the presentation of data in all tables.

Reviewer: tab. 4, 5 and 6 delete by author
Author: According to the reviewer, we deleted tables 4, 5, and 6.

Dr. Abedi

Reviewer: Regarding the topic of the effect of two types of exercises, the introduction does not mention the effects of exercise and its various models
Author: These articles were added to the effect of different types of exercises.

Reviewer: Regarding the three experimental groups and the lack of control group of the researcher how to control the effect of time
Author: In previous studies, a comparison was made between the exercise group and the control group. It has also been studied the effect of various sports protocols on dependent variables such as heart rate and blood pressure. So, we were looking at comparing three different types of physical activity and exercise to suggest the best exercise protocol based on the results.

Reviewer: Valid reference is required
Author: We added valid reference.

Reviewer: Valid reference is required
Author: We added valid reference.

Reviewer: The cost of energy for the three exercises is calculated
Author: In exercise science, the workload increases in different ways.

a. Exercise intensity

B. Exercise time

C. The number of repetitions of each physical activity

In this study, to observe the principle of overload, we increased the number of repetitions of movements in order to check the compatibility of physical activity with dependent variables. In this research, the cost of energy was not calculated.

Reviewer: In the case of size statistics, the effect of data should be mentioned.
Author: According to the respected referee, the effect of the data was mentioned.

Reviewer: The number of tables should be reduced
Author: According to the respected referee, reduced the number of tables.

Reviewer: Intergroup and intergroup differences should be mentioned
Author: Intragroup and intergroup differences were mentioned.

Reviewer: New articles have been used in this field to be used by the researcher
Author: New articles were replaced with old articles.

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) 15 Jul 2019

Dear AE,
The changes are conducted properly.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 19 Jul 2019

Dear AE,
There are some comments to improve the manuscript
such as :
1- In table 1 mean± SEM is mean difference of sampling time in your study? if it is yes mean±SEM, please descript it under table
2- The results of your study show that significantly reduced resting heart rate in 4th and 8th weeks compared to 1 st weak, there for the mean±SEM should be with a minus sign. if it is true,please exert it for all of them in all tables.
3- Reference should be written based on the journal's format
Please look at the attachment file.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 20 Jul 2019

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 20 Jul 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 (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.

Reviewer 1:

Changes are conducted properly.

Author: Thanks for the guidance of the reviewer. .

Reviewer 2:

There are some comments to improve the manuscript. Such as:

1-In the table 1 mean± SEM is mean difference of sampling time in your study? If it is yes mean±SEM, please descript it under table

Author: We wrote the required descriptions below the table.

2- The results of your study show that significantly reduced resting heart rate in 4th and 8th weeks compared to 1st weak, there for the mean±SEM should be with a minus sign. If it is true, please exert it for all of them in all tables.
Author: Based on the comparative table in SPSS software:

Mean Difference = 1st week - 4st week

HR rest Pilates 1st week = 84.7

HR rest Pilates 4st week = 78.3

84.7-78.3=6.4

As a result, the mean difference is positive.

3- Please look at the attachment file.

Author: We corrected comments on the manuscript in the attachment. We have made changes to the turquoise blue. Changes are seen with Teal color.

4- Reference should be written based on the journal's format.

Author: We changed the references based on the journal format.

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.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 29 Jul 2019

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 30 Jul 2019

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 30 Jul 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.