

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>



Peer Review Report for "Acute Inflammatory Response to a Single Bout of Resistance Exercise with or Without Blood Flow Restriction"

Author(s): Mohammad Bani Asadi, Hassan Sharifi, Bahram Abedi, Hoseyn Fatolahi

Review Timeline:

▶ Submit Date: 25 Oct 2020
▶ Accepted Date: 27 Feb 2021

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)

12 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
Translation needs to be done. Additionally, Academic writing hasn't been well written. Before reviewing, it's highly recommended to check the mentioned comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | Revision (0)

12 Dec 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1- The rationale for conducting the study is weak. Just knowing this response, what kind of application will it have for the participants?
2- How was the health condition of the participants determined?
3- Where were the exercises performed?
4- Who performed these laboratory examinations?
5- Who is going to benefit from these findings?
6- What was the strength and weakness of this research?
7- What was your suggestion for further research?
Thanks.

 **REFEREE:** Reviewer | **Revision (0)**

17 Dec 2020

Dear AE,

Comments for the authors:

- Abstract is full of grammatical errors.
- The division of the groups is written in a completely incomprehensible way.
- The abstract needs major editing.
- Introduction, very poorly written.
- Report reference for training protocol.
- Ancova is used for intergroup comparisons. Since you had pre-test and post-test measurements, which test did you use for in-group comparison?
- Please specify the paper extracted from the research project or thesis?
- Paper doesn't have an ethics code.
- Please specify the authors conflict.

Thanks.

 **REFEREE:** Associate Editor | **Revision (0)**

27 Feb 2021

Dear EIC

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

Kind regards.

 **REFEREE:** EIC | **Revision (0)**

27 Feb 2021

Dear Author,

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

Thanks.