

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-132585>

Published in: International Journal of Sport Studies for Health: 5(2); e132585

Peer Review Report for "Short-term Plyometric and Jump Rope Training Effect on Body Profile and Athletic Performance in Adolescent Basketball Players"

Author(s): Cagdas Ozgur Cengizel, Elvan Oz, Elif Cengizel

Review Timeline:

▶ Submit Date:	23 Oct 2022
▶ Revised Date:	31 Oct 2022
▶ Accepted Date:	6 Nov 2022

Revision (0)

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

Özgür Eken: Reviewer | **Revision (0)**

23 Oct 2022

Congratulations to the authors for the development of this work. The present study presents interesting data on the performance of adolescent basketball players.

-Introduction

In general, the introduction section provides a very good overview of the topic.

The hypotheses of the study should be mentioned.

-Methods

In the participants section:

How was the sample size determined?

Was a GPower test used? If yes, please report all variables from the GPower analysis.

More data is needed to verify your calculations. Please add the necessary information.

You wrote "The study was performed according to the World Medical Association

Declaration of Helsinki and approved by the Ethics Commission of ... University." Please fill in "...." and write the ethics approval number. Written consent should be given from

parents/guardians if the participants are under 18 years old. Please use a suitable sentence.

Study design:

Was there a familiarization phase in the study? When were the participants' anthropometric measurements collected?

Providing detailed information about the plyometric and rope training content in the study would strengthen the study. The sequence of exercises could be done with pictures as additional material. In fact, the exercises performed in the study could be written in such a way that the total exercise volume is indicated in a table according to the working and rest intervals.

Please indicate what time of day the exercises were performed.


Was there a warm-up before the exercises? If so, how long did it take?

-Results

The analyses are beautifully expressed in figures and tables.

-Discussion

The discussion section is well written. However, the limitations of the study should be added to the end of the discussion section.

 **shabnam delkash:** Reviewer | **Revision (0)**

29 Oct 2022

Dear Associate Editor

It needs minor revisions based on attached file.

Regards

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

29 Oct 2022

Dear Editor,

Based on the reviewer,s comments, the submitted manuscript needs some minor revisions.

Regards

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

29 Oct 2022

Dear Authors,

We believe that the revised manuscript is now in a much stronger form and we are confident that it will be a valuable addition to the journal. However, please kindly consider the comments in the attached files. Some information seems to be missing, for example, the name of the university that issued the ethical code.

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.

Reply to Reviewer 1

Introduction

R1: What are the hypotheses of the study? These need to be mentioned.

Answer: Our hypothesis has been added to the text.

Methods**In participants section**

R1: How did you determine sample size? Did you use G*Power test? If yes, report all variables from G*Power analysis. More data is needed to verify your calculations. Please add necessary info.

Answer: We used the easily accessible sampling method. In the research, it was a priority for us that all the players were on the same team. Therefore, we used the maximum number of players that could be on a basketball team and randomized the athletes into two separate groups. Our aim was to have two different training groups subjected the same basketball training. Because we thought that two different training interventions to be applied in different teams would affect the research results. To eliminate this effect, we chose this research design and we mentioned in the participants section as:

"All players were on the same team and attended to the same basketball trainings. Participants were randomly divided into two groups as plyometric (n=11, mean age and training experience: 13.6±0.9 y, 5.1±2.7 y, respectively) and jump rope training group (n=11, mean age and training experience: 13.8±0.9 y, 6.0±1.7 y, respectively)."

R1: Giving detailed information about the plyometric and rope training content in the study will strengthen the study. Also, the sequence of exercises can be done with pictures as additional material. In fact, the exercises performed in the study can be written in such a way that the total exercise volume is indicated in the table according to the working and rest intervals.

Answer: we do not have pictures of the training drills. But the rest intervals already be mentioned in the method as "Full rest was given between test protocols during each session.". We gave a details about exercise volume in Table 1 as 'total' after your comments.

R1: You wrote "The study was performed according to the World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki and approved by the Ethics Commission of ... University." Please fill '.....' and write the number of Ethic approve. Written consent should be given from parents/guardians if they are under 18 years. Please use suitable sentence.

Answer: We filled the University name. To present a blind text, the authors avoid to use of University name in the Ethical Approval and Acknowledgement Section. But these informations are clearly written upon request and wrote a Ethical Approval number. It has already been written in the text as "The participants were instructed before the research and written informed consent was taken from their parents." . Maybe it was overlooked.

Study design

R1: Was there a familiarization phase in the study? When were the participants' anthropometric measurements collected?

Answer: The familiarization was expressed as:

“Before each test, the participants were given familiarization, which included one trial repetition.”

R1: Indicate what time of day the exercises are performed.

Answer: Time of the day the exercises were mentioned as “All measurements were taken at the evening training sessions (between 17:00-19:00).”

R1: Was there a warm-up before the exercises? If so how long did it take?

Answer: You can see the details we added below as highlighted:

Plyometric and jump rope training were applied after the warm-up (including 10 minutes self-selected warm-up protocol following by 10 minutes dynamic & static stretching), and then the athletes continued their routine basketball technical training.

Discussion

R1: The discussion section is well written. However, the limitations of the study should be added to the end of the discussion section

Answer: The limitation was added at the end of the discussion section as:

The number of participants (sample size) is the limitation of our research. However, since we applied training intervention in addition to basketball training for four weeks, we aimed to create a sample group from the players in the same team in order not to differentiate the possible effects of basketball training.

Reply to Reviewer 2

- P values have been added to the findings section of the summary.
- The changes the reviewer's requested has not been accepted. The authors prefer to use 'score' instead of 'value' for smatotype in the summary section and in all the text.
- All gramatical corrections have been accepted.
- To present a blind text, the authors avoid to use of University name in the Ethical Approval and Acknowledgement Section. But these informations are clearly written upon request.
- Since each athletic performance test is widely used in scientific researches, the validity and reliability values for each are not added separately.

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)

6 Nov 2022

Dear Researchers,

I,m pleased to inform you that the manuscript is endorsed for publication.