

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-134187>

Published in: International Journal of Sport Studies for Health: 5(2); e134187

Peer Review Report for "Effect of 12-Week Aerobic Exercise Training on Chemokine Ligands and Their Relative Receptors in Balb/C Mice with Breast Cancer"

Author(s): Mehrmoosh Esmailian, Hadi Nobari, Mehdi Kargarfard, Atefeh Amerizadeh, Fahimeh Esfarjani, Golnaz Vaseghi, Georgian Badicu, Pablo Prieto González, Luca Paolo Ardigo

Review Timeline:

▶ Submit Date:	12 Dec 2022
▶ Revised Date:	31 Dec 2022
▶ Accepted Date:	31 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.

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

30 Dec 2022

Dear authors,

Please consider the following minor revisions.

In the abstract section, it is recommended to first mention the background research before presenting the objective. Additionally, it is important to set the keywords based on the mesh standard. The demographic information of the subjects should be included in the methodology section of the abstract.

The Ethics Issue should be relocated to the end of the methodology section.

At the end of the introduction section, you have provided the research report.


According to Trosid et al., aerobic exercise training (AET) can reduce plasma levels of CCL2 in patients with metabolic syndrome. It is important to discuss the necessity of conducting this research.

Detailed research protocols should include relevant references.

The sentence in line 220 contains a grammatical error. Please correct it.

"Exercise has a positive effect on breast cancer (BC) by reducing the levels of CCL2 and CCL5 chemokines and their receptors."

The discussion and conclusion section should include an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of this work, as well as a statement of the research limitations.

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

30 Dec 2022

Dear Researchers,

Thank you for submitting the article to the journal. I appreciate the value and strength of your work. please kindly consider the points raised by respected Associate Editor.

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

Thank you very much for your comments. All of them have been taken into account, and we consider that they are very useful to improve the quality of the study. Hereunder we explain the modifications made in the article, which have been underlined in yellow in the manuscript.

COMMENT: In the abstract section, it is better to mention the background research before presenting objective, and also set the keywords based on the mesh standard.

RESPONSE: The background has been improved. More details introducing the topic have been added. The keywords have also been reviewed.

COMMENT: The demographic information of the subjects should be mentioned in the methodology section of the abstract.

RESPONSE: The demographic information has been added.

COMMENT: The Ethics Issue should be moved to the end of the methodology section.

RESPONSE: It has been moved to the end of the methodology section, just before the statistical analysis section.

COMMENT: At the end of the introduction section, you have presented the report of this research. "According to Trosid et al., aerobic exercise training (AET) 64 could lower plasma levels of CCL2 in patients with metabolic syndrome.", while, It is better to talk about the necessity of doing this research

RESPONSE: This suggestion has been taken into account and explained at the end of the introduction, explaining the necessity to conduct the present study.

COMMENT: References related to detailed research protocols should be cited.

RESPONSE: References related to detailed research protocols have been provided throughout the manuscript.

COMMENT: The following sentence in line 220 has a grammatical problem, please revise it: "One of the main mechanisms of the positive effect of exercise on BC is by reducing the level 221 of CCL2 and CCL5 chemokines and their receptors."

RESPONSE: The mentioned sentence has been corrected.


COMMENT: The strengths and weaknesses of this work should be stated in the discussion and conclusion section and the limitations of the research should also be stated

RESPONSE: strengths and weaknesses were added at the end of the discussion.

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)

31 Dec 2022

Dear authors,

I would like to thank the Associate Editor for thoughtful comments and efforts of respected authors towards improving the manuscript. Its now accepted.