Int J Sport Stud Health. Open Peer Review; e133845.

Page 1 of 11

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

Peer Review Report for "Is Mental Toughness Related with Motor Learning in Wrestling?"

Author(s): Sadegh Ranjbar, Ali Akbarnejad, Ashkan Alizadeh, Ali Fadakar

Review Timeline:

▸ Submit Date:	29 Nov 2022
▸ Revised Date:	24 Dec 2022
▸ Accepted Date:	3 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.

💬 **Maghsoud Nabilpour**: Reviewer | **Revision (**0**)**   4 Dec 2022

Dear Authors,

I have reviewed your paper and have the following comments:

Abstract

In line 14, you state that "half of them [the participants] were mentally tough and the others were low." You do not specify how you determined this. If you used a questionnaire, please introduce it here. This information should also be included in the methodology section. You should check the keywords in the Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) database to ensure that they are appropriate for your paper.
Background

In line 44, you use the word "strong" to describe the evidence for the relationship between mental toughness and wrestling performance. However, you only cite two references. This is not enough evidence to support such a strong statement.
From lines 54 to 79, you provide a detailed review of the literature on the definition of stubbornness. This is not necessary. A brief definition of stubbornness is sufficient. You

can refer to the following reference for a comprehensive definition:

Connaughton D, Wadey R, Hanton S, Jones G. The development and maintenance of mental toughness: Perceptions of elite performers. Journal of sports sciences. 2008;26(1):83-95.

Methodology

Please explain how many minutes were spent on each wrestling skill. Were the skills taught at the same time or did you move on to another skill after completing the training of one skill? If yes, how many sessions were spent for each skill?

Regardless of mental toughness, was there a relationship between wrestling scores and physical fitness?

What was the scale of the ship test? Did the researcher make it? Determine its validity and reliability.

It would be better if you used a mixed-model ANOVA instead of a one-way ANOVA.

It would be better if you used the Sport Mental Toughness Questionnaire (SMQ) instead of the Mental Toughness Questionnaire-48 (MTQ-48; Clough, Earle, & Sewell, 2002).

The reliability of the Afsaneh Poorak and Vaez Moosavi (2015) questionnaire is for the SMQ, not the MTQ-48.

It is recommended to examine the correlation of each of the wrestling skills with the mental toughness subscales and report the cases with high and low correlations.

Discussion

From lines 194 to 201, you repeat some of the information from the methodology section. This is unnecessary.

You should provide a reference for lines 245 and 246.

References

The reference for line 1 AD is incorrect. The correct year is 1900.

Most of the sources you cite are from before 2015. It would be helpful to update these sources with more recent research.

Please Provide the point-by-point responses for the comments.

💬 **REFEREE**: Reviewer | **Revision (0)**   5 Dec 2022

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

The title of the manuscript is not appropriate because it does not mention the topic of wrestling.

Subject: An article on this topic has been published in the Sports Psychology Journal of Shahid Beheshti University

Mental toughness in young athlete with excellent and poor level of wrestling skills learning (with considering acquisition and retention scores)

Abstract:

How did you recognize that the subjects were mentally tough and low? (Mention Mental

Int J Sport Stud Health. Open Peer Review; e133845.

Page 4 of 11

Toughness-48 questionnaires)

In the result section of abstract it is not necessary to write normality of the data tests (lines 24, 25)

Background:

Some sentences are long and vague and need editing.

In line 64 mental not Mental

In line 64 you have not mentioned the year in front of the researcher's name

In line 68 you have not mentioned any refence

In line 71 you have not mentioned any refence

In line 73 you have not mentioned the year

The necessity and importance of the study has not been properly stated, there is no proper conclusion at the end of the introduction.

Methods

Summarize the methods section and write more fluently and clearly

The statistical software and significance level are not mentioned

Results

It is not customary to refer to the normal distribution of data (Lines 177-179), It is suggested to delete table 1

Some sentences are redundant (lines 183-184)

In line 193 you have not mentioned any refence

Discussion

These part are repetitive and you have written them in introduction and methods sections (lines 194-207)

In line 214 Jackman et al 2016 (2019)! you have not mentioned refence number.

In line 226 you have not mentioned any refence.

The discussion section is too long and boring and does not properly focus on the results of the study and comparisons with other studies.

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

12 Dec 2022

Dear Authors,

I would be grateful if you could kindly consider these revisions and make the necessary changes to your paper.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

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.

we would like to thanks Reviewer1

your feedbacks is truly appreciated.

Reviewer 1:

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 of the manuscript is not appropriate. Wrestling is not mentioned.

revised

Subject: An article on this topic has been published in the Sports Psychology Journal of Shahid Beheshti University

Mental toughness in young athlete with excellent and poor level of wrestling skills learning (with considering acquisition and retention scores)

That Research has been done by one of the writers of this manuscript but the methodology of this research is different with that published article. If it is necessary we can cite that research in this manuscript.

Abstract:

How did you recognize that the subjects were mentally tough and low? (Mention Mental Toughness-48 questionnaires)

revised

In the result section of abstract it is not necessary to write normality of the data tests (lines 24, 25)

revised

Background:

Some sentences are long and vague and need editing.

In line 64 mental not Mental

revised

In line 64 you have not mentioned the year in front of the researcher's name

revised

In line 68 you have not mentioned any refence

revised

In line 71 you have not mentioned any refence

revised

In line 73 you have not mentioned the year

revised

The necessity and importance of the study has not been properly stated, there is no proper conclusion at the end of the introduction.

revised

Methods

Summarize the methods section and write more fluently and clearly

The statistical software and significance level are not mentioned

revised

Results

It is not customary to refer to the normal distribution of data (Lines 177-179), It is suggested to delete table 1

Some sentences are redundant (lines 183-184)

revised

In line 193 you have not mentioned any refence

revised

Discussion

These part are repetitive and you have written them in introduction and methods sections (lines 194-207)

It removed

In line 214 Jackman et al 2016 (2019)! you have not mentioned refence number

In line 226 you have not mentioned any refence

revised

The discussion section is too long and boring and does not properly focus on the results of the study and comparisons with other studies.

we would like to thanks Reviewer2

your feedbacks is truly appreciated.

Reviewer 2:

Abstract

In line 14, you said:

"Using intensity sampling method, 28 students - 13 athletes, who never had any past wrestling skill practices, were selected, so that half of them 14 were mentally tough and the others were low"

How did you find out about this? If you used a questionnaire, you should have introduced that questionnaire.

It should be mentioned in the methodology of the statistical tests used.

revised

Check the keywords in the mesh

It checked.

Background

In line 44, delete the word strong. With two references, it is not possible to emphasize much unless you were referring to meta-analysis.

revised

From lines 54 to 79, you have examined the definition of stubbornness. Really, this amount of literature is not needed to define stubbornness. It is better to enter the statement of the problem and necessity of the research with a comprehensive definition.

For a comprehensive definition of stubbornness, you can refer to this reference.

Connaughton D, Wadey R, Hanton S, Jones G. The development and maintenance of mental toughness: Perceptions of elite performers. Journal of sports sciences. 2008;26(1):83-95.

Regarding that, there is still an ongoing controversy concerning the definition of mental toughness. we refer to the literature and other models about this notion. in this study Cluff et al (2001) is used the Connaughton model is different with Cluff model so we refer that model along with other models

Methodology

Please explain how many minutes were spent on each wrestling skill. Were the skills taught at the same time or did you move on to another skill after completing the training of one skill? If yes, how many sessions were spent for each skill?

added

Regardless of mental toughness, was there a relationship between wrestling scores and physical fitness?

We didn't investigate the relationship between wrestling scores and physical fitness. The subjects were selected from physical education students who were enrolled in a physical fitness course so all of them were good in overall physical fitness

What was the scale of the ship test? Did the researcher make it? Determine its validity and reliability.

It was made by National Olympic Committee of Iran and the reference was mentioned

It would be better if you used Anova mix instead of one-way ANOVA

Because the result doesn't change we use the one-way ANOVA. However, if it is necessary we can use Anova mix

It would be better if you used the sport Mental Toughness Questionnaire instead of The Mental Toughness Questionnaire-48 (MTQ48; Clough, Earle, & Sewell, 2002).

The reliability of the Afsaneh Poorak and Vaez Moosavi (2015) questionnaire is for the sports Mental Toughness Questionnaire, not for the Mental Toughness Questionnaire-48.

The reliability and validity of The Mental Toughness Questionnaire-48 was approved by Afsaneh Poorak and Vaez Moosavi in sport population the reference is given below:

https://www.magiran.com/paper/1344818

It is recommended to examine the correlation of each of the wrestling skills with the mental toughness subscales and report the cases with high and low correlations.

For summarizing the manuscript we report advanced t-test if it is necessary in view of editorial board the result of correlation will be reported.

Discuss

From lines 194 to 201, the items related to the methodology have been mentioned. These cases are both repetitive and related to methodology

revised

Provide a reference for lines 245 and 246.

revised

references

The reference publication year is 1 AD

revised

Most of the sources are related to the year before 2015. Sources should be updated

revised

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.

💬 **Leila Youzbashi**: Reviewer | **Revision (1)**   `30 Dec 2022`

Dear Associate Editor,
I am writing to inform you that all of the points asked for have been revised and accepted.
Best Regards

💬 **Maghsoud Nabilpour**: Reviewer | **Revision (1)**   `31 Dec 2022`

Dear Researchers,
Thank you for your careful attention to the reviewer comments and your willingness to make the necessary revisions. Im confident that your revised paper will be a valuable addition to the journal.
Good Luck

💬 **Morteza Taheri**: EIC | **Revision (1)**   `3 Jan 2023`

Dear Authors,

Congratulations! Your revisions have been accepted. We are pleased to announce that your paper, will be published in the upcoming issue. We appreciate your careful attention to the reviewer comments and your willingness to make the necessary revisions. We believe that your paper has made a significant contribution to the field, and we are excited to share it with our readers.
We will be sending you the page proofs soon for your final review. Thank you again for your hard work on this project. We look forward to publishing your paper.
Regards
EIC