

## 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>



International Journal of Sport Studies for Health

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5812/intjssh-134823>

Published in: International Journal of Sport Studies for Health: 5(2); e134823

## Peer Review Report for "A Single-Session Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing (EMDR) Therapy Reduces Anxiety and Improves Self-confidence in Athletes with Post-traumatic Stress Associated with Injury"

**Author(s):** Luis Felipe Reynoso-Sánchez, José Raúl Hoyos-Flores

### Review Timeline:

▶ Submit Date:	9 Jan 2023
▶ Revised Date:	25 Jan 2023
▶ Accepted Date:	26 Jan 2023

### Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers, Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

**Leila Youzbashi:** Reviewer | **Revision (0)**

17 Jan 2023

First of all, I would like to thank the authors for conducting this applied research. However, I have several comments and suggestions to improve its quality.

Title:

EMDR therapy reduces anxiety and improves self-confidence in athletes with post-traumatic stress associated with injury

The title reflects the content appropriately but Similar titles have been already conducted on this field like:

\*The Effect of Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing (EMDR) on Anxiety and Physical Performance in Athletes

\*Cognitive Hypnotherapy and EMDR: Two Effective Psychodynamic Therapies for the Rapid Reduction of Cognitive Anxiety. how do you justify the novelty of your work.

**\*Abstract:**

The abstract is written too long.

Why is the code of ethics not written?

**\*Introduction:**

It is suggested to write PTSD in line 36 after "post-traumatic stress disorder" in parentheses (PTSD)

. There is no reference for this sentence in lines 59-61

. Some sentences are repetitive

. The introduction is weak and the necessity of the topic is not properly defined.

**\*Methods**

the sample size is so small! It is like case report!

Was there no information about anxiety and self-confidence before the injury?

Were they elite athletes? Male or female?

What was their sports background? At what level do they practice or train?

Is there a difference between team and individual athletes?

How do you find and recognize subjects? For example, from clinic or they referred themselves or...?

How many sessions intervention was done?

Is only a 30–50-minute session effective?

**Results**

Figure 2: why time of intervention is different for each subject? no one is not the same.

For athlete 3, intervention time is 30 min? Can 30 minutes of an intervention be effective?

**\*Discussion**

It is not strong enough; the sample size is too small and the intervention is only one session, so it cannot be generalized. what's your logic?

Some sentences are repetitive

**\*References**

Most of the references are not from the last years.

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

18 Jan 2023

The reviewer wants to thank author(s) for their efforts in preparing the following manuscript, although some corrections and modifications should be made to improve its quality.

 **Arefe mohamadnezhad:** Reviewer | **Revision (0)**

18 Jan 2023

Dear Researchers,

You can see some comments in the following. Please kindly provide point-by-point responses for each comment.

- Abstract

Methods: Line 7: To identify & Line 9: Such as

Results: Line 3: Afterwards

Keywords: Post-traumatic stress disorder should be mentioned in the keywords

- Background

Paragraph 1- Line 6: Mental anxiety is better than cognitive anxiety

Paragraph 2: It is better to explain the signs and symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder and its effects on life a little more

Paragraph 4- Line 15: Did you infer it or did the research cited in the source infer it?

-Objectives

Line 1: By Yang ??!!!!

Line 2: Syndrome or disorder? Be aligned throughout the text

- Instruments

CSAI-2RD- Line1-3: Please mention the name of the designer of the questionnaire

EMDR Therapy : It is better to state the steps of the therapy in the table

-Data analysis

Line 6-11: Should be mentioned in the table

-Discussion

Line 3-6: First, state the result of your hypothesis investigation, then confirm it with other sources

Paragraph 5- Line 1: Were there only these two limitations?!


-References

Adjust according to the format

Please follow the format completely

The whole text should be revised in terms of structure and phrasing.

---

 **Maghsoud Nabilpour:** Associate Editor | **Revision (0)**

19 Jan 2023

Dear Researchers

Thank you for submitting your valuable manuscript to our journal. We are pleased to inform you that the review of your manuscript is complete, and based on the editorial decision, it requires some minor revisions. Although this manuscript has sufficient quality to be published, there are some points of view that require significant minor revisions yet.

---

 **Morteza Taheri:** EIC | **Revision (0)**

19 Jan 2023

Dear Authors

This is to ask you to consider the points raised by respected reviewers and provide necessary amendments. please kindly provide Point-by Point responses.

## 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

### Reviewer 1:

1. Title: EMDR therapy reduces anxiety and improves self-confidence in athletes with post-traumatic stress associated with injury. The title reflects the content appropriately, but Similar titles have been worked on in this field like:

*The Effect of Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing (EMDR) on Anxiety and Physical Performance in Athletes.*

*Cognitive Hypnotherapy and EMDR: Two Effective Psychodynamic Therapies for the Rapid Reduction of Cognitive Anxiety*

Answer: Thank you for your suggestion, we appreciate it. After a brief review in the literature and the emphasis of the single-session EMDR used in our study, the title proposed for this paper is “A single-session Eye movement desensitization and reprocessing (EMDR) therapy reduces anxiety and improves self-confidence in athletes with post-traumatic stress associated with injury”.

### 2. Abstract:

2.1. *The abstract is written too long!*

Response: Thank you for your observation. Due to the difficulty of summarizing the relevant elements of the research we need to spend all these words for the abstract. However, it is in accordance with the journal guidelines for this section.

2.2. *Why the code of ethics is not written?*

Response: Thank you for your comment. The ethical approval and code of ethics followed for the study were added on the procedure section of the document (lines 107 – 109) “The study was approved by the Sport Psychology Department of the Autonomous University of Nuevo Leon and followed the ethical guidelines and the recommendations of the Helsinki declaration on the treatment of the subjects and the data obtained”. Also, a brief ethics statement was added in the abstract.

2.3. *Report p values*

Response: Due to the data analysis method employed, based on the magnitudes of change, we have not p values on our results.

### 3. Introduction:

3.1. *It is suggested to write PTSD in line 36 after "post-traumatic stress disorder" in parentheses (PTSD)*

Response: Your suggestion was considered and added in parentheses PTSD (Line 39).

3.2. *There is no reference for this sentence in line 59-61*

Response: Thank you for your comment. We cited in line 73 the references who support the idea.

### *3.3. Some sentences are repetitive.*

Response: Thank you for your comment. The entire background was revised and adjusted to a better explanation of the idea without repetitive sentences.

In line 36, the first idea was separated with a period.

Line 46: The following sentence was added “who had suffered a traumatic event such an injury”.

### *3.4. The introduction is weak and the necessity of the topic is not properly defined*

Response: Thank you for your comment. Following your observation, the first paragraph was modified, adding the explanation for PTSD. Also, we added information in lines 50 – 54 and 62 – 64 to reinforce the background and a better definition of the research problem.

## *4. Methods*

### *4.1. the sample size is so small! It is like case report!*

Response: Thank you for your observation. Following our results, the literature and your suggestion, we added some information to adapt the document as a case study.

### *4.2. Was there no information about anxiety and self-confidence before the injury?*

Response: Thank you for your question. There is no information about the measured variables before the injury. Athletes were recruited as a part of a project which had the objective to associate the variables and analyze the potential beneficial effect of the EMDR in athletes who suffered mental block performance after a traumatic event such an injury.

### *4.3. Were they elite athletes? Male or female?*

Response: Thank you for your observation. Participants were 3 males and 1 woman. Gender was added on text in the athlete’s description (lines 98-99).

### *4.4. What was their sports background? At what level do they practice or train?*

Response: Thank you for your comment. All the participants competed at international level before suffering their injuries. When the intervention was made, the four athletes competed at national level and trained with their university teams. This explanation was added in lines 99-100 and 104-105.

### *4.5. Is there a difference between team and individual athletes?*

Response: Thank you for your question. There were no differences in terms of type of sport. Due to the measurements obtained, it was not possible to analyze according to the type of sport.

*4.6. How do you find and recognize subjects? For example, from clinic or they referred themselves or...?*

Response: Thank you for your observation. The researchers, through the university's sports medicine department, had a first approach with potential study participants. The following lines were added to the text in the procedure section (112 – 115): The researchers obtained permission to disseminate information about the project to the university's sports medicine department (in charge of the rehabilitation of athletes representing the institution). Subjects referred themselves to researchers to participate in the study. Those who met the inclusion characteristics were invited by researchers to participate in the study.

*4.7. How many sessions intervention was done?*

Response: Only one intervention session was applied due to the time possibilities of the therapist specialized in EMDR therapy. The athletes were informed about the protocol and the possible benefits of this therapeutic method even in a single session.

*4.8. Is only a 30–50-minute session effective?!*

Response: Thank you for your question. Due to the time limitation of the specialized therapist we had to resort to using a single session. However, a recent study (Bowman AW, Turner MJ. When time is of the essence: The use of rational emotive behavior therapy (REBT) informed single-session therapy (SST) to alleviate social and golf-specific anxiety, and improve wellbeing and performance, in amateur golfers. Psychol Sport Exerc. 2022 May;60:102167.) using rational emotive therapy to alleviate anxiety-related symptoms in amateur golfers, shows positive evidence of the influence that a single session of therapy based on the cognitive behavioral approach can have. We have added this rationale in the text (lines 122-125).

## *5. Results*

*5.1. Figure 2: why time of intervention is different for each subject? no one is not the same. For athlete 3, intervention time is 30 min? Can 30 minutes of an intervention be effective?*

Response: Thank you for your question. The differences in time for each subject depends on the individual process in the EMDR application. A subject can need to reprocessing some information or spend more time in the expression of the traumatic event and processing the alternative cognitions. The sentence “depending on the course of the procedure and the need for trauma reprocessing in some cases” was added on lines 125 – 126 for a better explanation.

## *6. Discussion*

*6.1. Is not strong enough, the sample size is too small and the intervention is only one session and it cannot be generalized*

Response: Thank you for your comment. Following your suggestions, we add information and explanation of the results with their respective evidence in lines 237 – 248. In addition,



we add other limitations that the study had in lines 282 – 285. Also, we improve the strengths and future research lines in the lines 288 – 293.

### *6.2. Some sentences are repetitive*

Response: Thank you for your observation. We review the document and improve this section to a better understanding of the information.

## *7. References*

### *7.1. Most of the references are not for the last years*

Response: We add 12 more reference published in 2017 or after.

### **Reviewer 2:**

### **Reviewer 3:**

#### *1. Abstract*

##### *1.1. Methods: Line 7 : Out to identify & Line 9: Such as*

Answer: Thank you for your observations. Changes in the sentences were made (lines 18 and 20). However, the sentence “such as” was not right for the idea, instead of, we added “used as” to pointed out that HRV was employed as biofeedback in the EMDR application. Furthermore, we made a change in the sentence of line 21, changing "protocol to associate with moments of stress and relief." instead of "protocol to associate with the stress and relief moments."

##### *1.2. Results: Line 3: afterward*

Answer: Thank you for your observation. We made the change to the correct form (line 26).

##### *1.3. keywords: Post-traumatic stress disorder should be mentioned in the keywords*

Answer: Thank you for your comment. We accepted your suggestion and change the keyword “stress disorder” for “posttraumatic stress disorder” (line 33).

#### *2. Background*

##### *2.1. Paragraph 1- Line 6: Mental anxiety is better than cognitive anxiety*

Answer: Thank you for your suggestion. We appreciate it and are agree with your comment, however, in accordance with the terms employed by the instrument than we used to measure anxiety (cognitive and somatic components), we decided to maintain the term “cognitive anxiety”.

##### *2.2. Paragraph 2: It is better to explain the signs and symptoms of post-traumatic stress syndrome and its effects on life a little more*

Answer: Thank you for your suggestion. We accepted it and explained the characteristics of the PTSD in the paragraph 1 (lines 40 – 45).

2.3. Paragraph 4- Line 15: *Did you infer it or the research cited in the source infer it?*

Answer: Thank you for your comment. We cited some references which exposed the idea of this sentence (line 73).

### 3. Objectives

3.1. Line 1: *y Yang ??!!!!*

Answer: Thank you for your observation. We made the correction for this mistake (line 89).

3.2. Line2: *Syndrome or disorder? be aligned throughout the text*

Answer: Thank you for your observation. We change the concept “syndrome” for the right one, “disorder” (line 92).

### 4. Instruments

4.1. CSAI-2RD- Line1-3: *Please mention the name of the designer of the questionnaire*

Answer: Thank you for your comment. We added in text the name of the designer of the questionnaire (line 136).

4.2. EMDR Therapy : *It is better to state the steps in the table*

Answer: Thank you for your observation. We accepted it and made a Table to present the steps for the EMDR intervention (Table 1).

Note. Table 1 and 2 of the original document sent for the first review in the journal changed for Table 2 and 3 respectively.

4.3. Data analysis

4.3.1. Line 6-11: *be mentioned in the table*

Answer: Thank you for your suggestion. Authors do not to consider necessary a table for this information. In addition, the journal has a limit on the number of figures and tables which has been reached in the article.

### 5. Discussion

5.1. Line 3-6: *First, state the result of your hypothesis investigation, then state its confirmation by other sources*

Answer: Thank you for your comment. The reference cited in these lines refers to the statistical method used to analyze our data. It is not to confirm our findings with the existed literature.

5.2. Paragraph 5- Line 1: *Was it only these two limitations?!*

Answer: Thank you for your observation. We add other limitations that the study had in lines 282 – 285. Also, we improve the strengths and future research lines in the lines 288 – 293.

## 6. *References*


### 6.1. *Adjust according to the format*

Response: Thank you for your comment. We adjusted the reference according to the journal format.

## 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.

 **Morteza Taheri:** EIC | Revision (1)

26 Jan 2023

Dear Researchers,

I would like to inform you that your manuscript has been accepted for your publication.

Regards

EIC