

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-138396>

Published in: International Journal of Sport Studies for Health: 6(1); e138396

Peer Review Report for "Anthropometric and Physical Profile Among the Different Age Groups of Tunisian Tennis Players"

Author(s): Saeed Meflah Alshahrani, Atef Salem, Anis Zribi, Khaled Trabelsi, Achraf Ammar, Hamdi Chtourou

Review Timeline:

▶ Submit Date:	25 Jun 2023
▶ Revised Date:	18 Jul 2023
▶ Accepted Date:	27 Jul 2023

Revision (0)

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

abolfazl ziraki: Reviewer | **Revision (0)**

9 Jul 2023

Public Comment:

This is a valuable study investigating the anthropometric and physical profile of Tunisian tennis players aged 7 to 17 years old. The researchers assigned athletes into different groups based on age and conducted various tests and measurements. However, there are some areas for improvement that the authors should consider.


Firstly, while the testing procedures are well-written in the method section, the authors should add a statement in the introduction or objective section to explain the rationale for choosing these tests and link the necessity of this testing to the tennis sport. Additionally, the authors should specify which components of physical fitness each test measures.

Secondly, while the main objective of the research was to investigate the physical profile of Tunisian tennis players in different age groups, a description of each group would be of great interest. The authors should provide a justification for comparing different age groups

and reporting the correlation of different variables as the objective of the study.

Thirdly, while the study has many variables to discuss in the discussion section, the authors mostly report the comparison of height and weight of athletes from different countries. The authors should explain why they decided to compare the physical aspects of athletes from different geographical regions.

Regarding minor points, in lines 33 and 34, two similar citations are repeated continuously, and the authors should use one citation for both sentences. The standing board jump is not equivalent to the abbreviation (SLJ) mentioned in line 83. The authors should state the Luc leger procedure in the testing procedure section, and include the unit for the luc leger data in Table 2. Finally, it is suggested not to use an abbreviation for the word sprint, but if the authors decide to use it, they should indicate it at the first encounter.

 **Alireza Aminae**: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)**

9 Jul 2023


Public Comment:

In this excellent study, the researchers investigated Tunisian tennis players to create physical and anthropometric profiles based on age groups. The authors assessed the athletes in six groups (U9, U10, U11, U12, U14, and U18) using physical fitness tests. However, the reviewer has identified some areas for improvement where the authors can make substantial revisions.

Firstly, the background section needs more information about previous research done in the field of tennis players' physical profiling, and the literature review should provide more context. Secondly, the objective section mentions comparing Tunisian players to international standards, but the study does not present any information about this comparison. Additionally, identifying the strengths and weaknesses of tennis players is another objective that did not reach or conclude in the discussion section.

Regarding the method section, while it is well-written, the age group classification presented in the study is somewhat ambiguous. The authors should justify the reason for comparing different age groups, especially for physical fitness components that improve with age. The procedures for the luc leger test are also not mentioned. Furthermore, the authors should justify the reporting of correlations among variables, such as the correlation between height and body mass.

In Table 2, the authors should explain the meaning of the numbers in parentheses. For example, what do the negative numbers mean under the U11 column for the SAR test? In the discussion section, the authors should provide a more substantial revision of content to support the hypothesis and reported results. The authors should also explain the abbreviation "COD" in line 247 and revise the sentence in line 264.

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

13 Jul 2023

Dear Researchers,

Based on the feedback from the associate editor and reviewer, it appears that some minor revisions are required for your manuscript. Please make the necessary revisions and send it back to us.

Best regards.

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.

Point by point responses to reviewer

Reviewer 1

We thank the reviewer for the constructive comments they have provided. We have made attempts to address each comment and believe that the manuscript has been drastically improved as a result of the suggested changes.

- While the testing procedures are well-written in the method section, the authors should add a statement in the introduction or objective section to explain the rationale for choosing these tests and link the necessity of this testing to the tennis sport. The authors should specify which components of physical fitness each test measures.

Correction made as suggested.

Please see changes made in the Background and Objective sections.

- While the main objective of the research was to investigate the physical profile of Tunisian tennis players in different age groups, a description of each group would be of great interest.

Correction made as suggested.

Please see changes made in the text

- The authors should provide a justification for comparing different age groups and reporting the correlation of different variables as the objective of the study.

As known, Correlation is a statistical method used to assess a possible linear association between continuous variables. Reporting correlations between different variables helps us explore potential relationships between physical attributes and tennis performance. By examining these associations, we can gain insights into the importance of specific physical characteristics in different age groups and their potential impact on overall tennis performance.

We hope that this point is clearer now.

- While the study has many variables to discuss in the discussion section, the authors mostly report the comparison of height and weight of athletes from different countries. The authors should explain why they decided to compare the physical aspects of athletes from different geographical regions.

Please see changes made in the Discussion section.

- Regarding minor points, in lines 33 and 34, two similar citations are repeated continuously, and the authors should use one citation for both sentences.

Correction made as suggested.

Please see changes made in the Background section.

- The standing board jump is not equivalent to the abbreviation (SLJ) mentioned in line 83.

Correction made as suggested.

- The authors should state the Luc leger procedure in the testing procedure section and include the unit for the luc leger data in Table 2.

Correction made as suggested. We added the Luc leger test (20-meter shuttle run test) procedure in the methods section. Also, we replace the score of this test in Table 2 which presented the number of the stage reached in the test with the estimation of the VO_{2max} , according to Leger et al. (1988). We reanalyse the Vo_{2max} data and adjusted the results part according to the new statistical results.

Please see changes made in the Methods and results sections.

- It is suggested not to use an abbreviation for the word sprint, but if the authors decide to use it, they should indicate it at the first encounter.

The abbreviation for the word sprint was removed in all the manuscript as suggested.

Associate Editor

We thank the associate editor for the constructive comments they have provided. We have made attempts to address each comment and believe that the manuscript has now been drastically improved as a result of the changes we performed.

- The background section needs more information about previous research done in the field of tennis players' physical profiling, and the literature review should provide more context.

Correction made as suggested.

Please see changes made in the Background section.

- The objective section mentions comparing Tunisian players to international standards, but the study does not present any information about this comparison.

We conducted a comprehensive analysis of Tunisian players, examining various performance metrics, and physical attributes. By leveraging data from previous research on foreign players, we sought to scale and contextualize the findings of our study. Although a direct statistical comparison between Tunisian and foreign players was not conducted in this study, our analysis aimed to provide valuable insights and contribute to the understanding of Tunisian players' abilities.

We hope that this point is clearer now.

- Identifying the strengths and weaknesses of tennis players is another objective that did not reach or conclude in the discussion section.

Correction made as suggested.

Please see changes made in the Discussion section.

- Regarding the method section, while it is well-written, the age group classification presented in the study is somewhat ambiguous. The authors should justify the reason for comparing different age groups, especially for physical fitness components that improve with age.

The study included a wide range of age groups (U9 to U18) to explore variations in physical fitness across different developmental stages, considering that biological maturation does not always directly correspond to increased physical performance (1,2). The authors also recognized the complex interplay between genetics and the environment, which is not simply additive (3). By comparing different age groups, they aimed to understand how these interactions manifest and investigate the relationship between age and physical fitness components. This approach provides a comprehensive understanding of these factors, uncovering potential discrepancies between biological maturation and physical performance reported in previous research, while acknowledging the general improvement of physical fitness with age.

We hope that this point is clearer now.

1. Ulbricht et al., 2016; DOI: [10.1519/JSC.0000000000001267](https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0000000000001267)
 2. Kovacs et al., 2007; DOI: [10.1519/JSC.0000000000001267](https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0000000000001267)
 3. Gómez-Campos et al., 2013; [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1888-7546\(13\)70051-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1888-7546(13)70051-0)
- The procedures for the luc leger test are also not mentioned.

Correction made as suggested.

Please see changes made in the Method section.

- Furthermore, the authors should justify the reporting of correlations among variables, such as the correlation between height and body mass.

In our study, we analysed and presented the correlation coefficients and p-values among variables, demonstrating the strength and significance of the relationships. Further, we aimed to show the relationship between standard tests (*i.e.*, SLJ, CMJ, sprints, ...) and its potential among tennis-specific tests, especially agility and change of direction tests (*i.e.*, Sideway shuffle, spider drill, and Zigzag tests). Concerning the correlation between height and body mass, we delete it from the results section.

We hope that this point is clearer now.

- In Table 2, the authors should explain the meaning of the numbers in parentheses. For example, what do the negative numbers mean under the U11 column for the SAR test?

Data for the SAR test was presented as Median (25th percentiles; 75th percentiles) as mentioned at the end of Table 2 caption, where data was non-normally distributed. Concerning the negative numbers, during the SAR test, the level of the toes is considered as zero. In this context, a negative score indicates that the participant was unable to reach their toes. A score of zero is considered average, indicating that the participant could reach their toes precisely. However, SAR test have a moderate mean criterion-related validity for estimating hamstring extensibility. In tennis, players often engage in repetitive movements that require quick acceleration, deceleration, and changes in direction. These movements can put significant strain on the hamstrings, leading to tightness and reduced flexibility.

We hope that this point is clearer now.

- In the discussion section, the authors should provide a more substantial revision of content to support the hypothesis and reported results.

Correction made as suggested.

Please see changes made in the Discussion section.

- The authors should also explain the abbreviation "COD" in line 247 and revise the sentence in line 264.


Correction made as suggested.

Please see changes made in the Discussion section.

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.

 **Alireza Aminae:** Associate Editor | **Revision (1)**

22 Jul 2023

Dear Editor,

all reviewers' suggestions and recommendations are properly corrected.

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

27 Jul 2023

Dear Researchers,

Your revised article has been accepted for publication. Please note that the English language will be further improved by an English language expert at the journal.

Best Wishes

EIC