




# The Need for More Attention to The Validity and Reliability of AI-Generated Exercise Programs


Seyed Milad. Saadati<sup>1\*</sup> 

<sup>1</sup> Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiology (LMP), University of Toronto, Canada


\* Corresponding author email address: m.saadati@mail.utoronto.ca

---

## E d i t o r

Hadi Nobari   
Professor, Transilvania University  
of Braşov, Braşov, Romania  
petrojonck@hotmail.com

## R e v i e w e r s

Elham Azimzadeh   
Faculty of Sport Sciences and Health, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran.  
Email: e\_azimzadeh@sbu.ac.ir

---

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1 Reviewer

Date: 28 November 2022

Reviewer: Overall, I found the article to be well-written and insightful, and I believe it could make a valuable contribution to the field with minor revisions. Below, I provide detailed feedback on various aspects of the manuscript.

Reviewer: The introduction provides a clear overview of the topic but lacks a strong thesis statement. It would benefit from a more concise and specific statement of the article's purpose and the issues it aims to address.

Response: Checked and done.

Reviewer: The commentary article would greatly benefit from the addition of a discussion section. This section should delve into the implications of the author's analysis, consider alternative viewpoints, and perhaps explore the practical implications of the discussed issues.

Response: Thanks.

Reviewer: The article generally flows well, but there are areas where the transition between paragraphs could be smoother. Consider adding transitional sentences or phrases to improve the overall coherence.

Response: Thank you. Edited.

Reviewer: The writing style is clear and easy to understand. However, there are instances where sentences could be more concise without sacrificing clarity. Trim unnecessary words to improve readability.

Response: Done.

Reviewer: Consider adding specific examples or case studies to illustrate key points and enhance reader engagement.

Response: Added.

Reviewer: Provide more concrete recommendations or suggestions in the conclusion to guide further research or action in the field.

Response: Done.

## 2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.