

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-134030>

Published in: International Journal of Sport Studies for Health: 5(2); e134030

Peer Review Report for "Plasma Volume Variations in Professional Soccer Players: Difference Between Pre- and Competitive Season"

Author(s): Abderraouf Ben Abderrahman, Nidhal Jebabli, Fatma Rhibi, Fabien Rivière, Emmeran Le Moal, Ismail Laher, Hassane Zouhal

Review Timeline:

▶ Submit Date:	5 Dec 2022
▶ Revised Date:	21 Dec 2022
▶ Accepted Date:	21 Dec 2022

Revision (0)

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

Masoud Mirmoezzi: Reviewer | **Revision (0)**

15 Dec 2022

Dear Researchers

This manuscript had the following strengths:

This manuscript had a clear central idea. Each paragraph had a clear main point or topic sentence. Each paragraph supports or expands the main idea of the manuscript .

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

15 Dec 2022

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:

The title reflect the content appropriately

*Abstract:

elite or sub-elite soccer players? It is written differently in abstract and keywords.

Because of the following article elite and sub-elite soccer players are not the same.
"A multidisciplinary approach to talent identification in soccer"

*Introduction:

The order of references 14 and 15 is not correct.

Methods

In 2.1. section was written sub-elite soccer players, but in abstract was written elite.

The code of ethics is not mentioned.

Was the absence, illness, or injury of the subjects considered? Didn't the number of subjects decrease?

Because of the measurement of body weight and fat, were eating habits controlled? Or were there any recommendations in this regard? Mention in methods.

How did you measure body fat? Which method?

How long was the fasting period?

*Results

table 2: Which test was used to check the relationship? You have not mentioned in the statistical analysis section

*Discussion

You did not measure muscle tone but you mentioned for justification of hypothesis 1.

In method section you did not mention diet and hydration were controlled!

*References

The references section of the paper should be up-to-date and relevant to the topic of the paper. The current references are a bit outdated, and they could be improved by adding some more references from the last five years.

 **Morteza Taheri:** Associate Editor | **Revision (0)**

15 Dec 2022

Dear Editor,

I am writing to you today to offer some minor revisions to the manuscript. Overall, I believe the work is good and ready for publication, but there are a few areas that could be improved based on the respected reviewers' comments.

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

15 Dec 2022

Dear Authors,

We have carefully reviewed your manuscript and have found that it has potential for publication. However, we would like to ask you to make some revisions before we can accept it. The reviewers have provided some helpful comments that we believe will improve your manuscript.

Good Luck

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.

Dear reviewer,

We thank you for your valuable time and for the constructive and helpful comments. We carefully addressed all of your concerns and suggestions in the following point-by-point statement. Amendments to the manuscript were made whenever necessary. We hope that you will find our revision suitable to be accepted for publication in the International Journal of Sport Studies for Health.

Reviewer 1:

This manuscript had the following strengths:

Response: Thank you

This manuscript had a clear central idea. Each paragraph had a clear main point or topic sentence. Each paragraph supports or expands the main idea of the manuscript.

Response: Thank you.

Reviewer 2: changes were highlighted in yellow

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:

The title reflect the content appropriately

Response: Thank you.

Abstract:

elite or sub-elite soccer players? It is written differently in abstract and keywords.

Because of the following article elite and sub-elite soccer players are not the same.

"A multidisciplinary approach to talent identification in soccer"

Response: We thank you for this comment. Elite soccer players from 1st French division soccer league. Statement has been changed in the abstract part: "Twenty soccer players from the 1st French division soccer league (Ligue 1) were included in the study"

Introduction:

The order of references 14 and 15 is not correct.

Response: We thank you for your valuable comment. Fault has rectified

Methods

In 2.1. section was written sub-elite soccer players, but in abstract was written elite.

Response: We thank the expert reviewer for this comment. The following was added:

“Twenty elite soccer players aged 20.3 ± 1.5 years old (70.9 ± 2.1 kg weight; 1.79 ± 2.1 m height; $11.4 \pm 0.7\%$ body fat; 62.7 ± 2 kg lean body mass), all members from 1st French division soccer league, participated in the current study.”

The code of ethics is not mentioned.

Response: We thank you for your valuable comment. The following was added: “The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and was approved from the Ethics Committee of the University of Rennes 2, France (EC-UR2/1597) before the beginning of subject recruitment.”

Was the absence, illness, or injury of the subjects considered? Didn't the number of subjects decrease?

Response: We thank you for your valuable comment. The number of players has not decreased. In fact, players were in good health with no chronic injuries (injuries >3 days) during the six months of the study.

Because of the measurement of body weight and fat, were eating habits controlled? Or were there any recommendations in this regard? Mention in methods. How did you measure body fat? Which method?

Response: We thank you for your valuable comment. The following statement was added in the Anthropometric measurements and blood sampling part (page 4): “For anthropometric measurements, body mass was measured to the nearest 0.1 kg on an electronic scale with participants wearing light clothing and walking barefoot (Kern, MFB 150K100). A measuring tape fixed to the wall was used to determine height to the nearest 0.5 cm. Also, four skinfolds and a Harpenden caliper were used to calculate body fat percentage (24). By subtracting the fat mass from the body mass, the fat free mass was calculated.”

24. Durnin JVGA, Womersley J. Body fat assessed from total body density and its estimation from skinfold thickness: measurements on 481 men and women aged from 16 to 72 years. *Br J Nutr.* 1974;32:77–97

How long was the fasting period?

Response: We thank you for your valuable comment. There is no fasting period during the preparatory or competitive phases. However, blood samples (10-ml) were systematically taken on an empty stomach, in the morning (8 ± 0.5). The following statement was added: “For blood sampling, blood samples (10-ml) were systematically taken on an empty stomach, in the morning after 8 ± 0.5 hours night sleeping, with a normalized semi-recumbent position, by the same nurse, in the antecubital vein.”

Results

table 2: Which test was used to check the relationship? You have not mentioned in the statistical analysis section

Response: We thank you for your valuable comment. The correlation coefficients (r) between the parameters, in each period, were evaluated using the Pearson test. This statement has been added.

Discussion

You did not measure muscle tone but you mentioned for justification of hypothesis 1.

Response: We thank you for your valuable comment. The anthropometric variation part, in discussion, has been re-worded. The following statement was added: “In agreement with the current results, Salhi et al. (27) showed that chronic football training has an effect on body composition and hormones associated with the process of physiological regulation of food consumption. In fact, soccer training might alter body composition (body composition, BMI, and BF%) in elite male soccer players by decreasing leptin levels and increasing GLP-1 levels. Other studies, such as Saidi et al. (10), reported that no significant anthropometric parameters were found after six weeks of training during the match congestion period. These

disparities in results could be explained mainly by differences in the evaluation period, as well as factors such as intensity, duration, frequency and the level of expertise of the players.”

10. Saidi K, Zouhal, H, Rhibi F, Tijani JM, Boullosa D, et al. *Effects of a six-week period of congested match play on plasma volume variations, hematological parameters, training workload and physical fitness in elite soccer players. PLoS One. 2019 ;14(7) :e0219692. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0219692>*

27. Salhi I, Abderrahman AB, Triki R, Clark CC, Gaed S, et al. *Gastrointestinal Hormones, Morphological Characteristics, and Physical Performance in Elite Soccer Players. International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance. 2022;1:1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1123/ijsp.2021-0484>.*

In method section you did not mention diet and hydration were controlled!

Response: We thank you for your valuable comment. participant part, in “Materials and methods”, has been re-worded. The following statement was added: “To minimize changes in anthropometric and hematological parameters related to diet, players were asked to follow a balanced diet (10 kcal/kg, 55% of which came from carbohydrates, 33% from lipids and 12% from proteins, as determined by an experienced nutritionist). Moreover, players were asked to follow a habitual hydration state according to their normal drinking behavior.”

References

References are not for the last five years.

Response: We thank you for your valuable suggestion. Recent references have been added:

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)**

21 Dec 2022

Dear Authors,

We would like to thank you for submitting your manuscript to our journal. It was carefully reviewed by our associate editor and two independent reviewers, who all agreed that it is a high-quality contribution to the field. We are confident that your manuscript will be a valuable addition to our journal and to the field of sports science. We look forward to publishing it in the near future.