

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-135272>

Published in: International Journal of Sport Studies for Health: 6(1); e135272

Peer Review Report for "The Impact of Different Attentional Focus Strategies During Modeling on the Acquisition and Retention of Free Throws in Basketball"

Author(s): Marjansadat Rezaei, Farzaneh Hatami, Gholamreza Lotfi

Review Timeline:

▶ Submit Date:	28 Jan 2023
▶ Revised Date:	23 Apr 2023
▶ Accepted Date:	23 Apr 2023

Revision (0)

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

Mostafa Soltani: Reviewer | **Revision (0)**

9 Feb 2023

Dear researchers,

You can see the recommended revisions as follows. Please do the necessary revisions and provide point by point responses with different colors.

- Line 19: The phrasing related to the statistical method of one-way analysis of variance should be corrected
- Line 66: Indicate the year of the research
- On page 5, it is better to mention the names of the authors and the year of the research
- On pages 5 and 6, all the researches you mentioned (parallel in gymnastics, backhand in table tennis, goalkeeping in football) are fine skills like your variable (basketball free throw) and all of them have shown a positive effect of focusing on internal and external attention on the teaching and learning of these skills; What was the need to do your research?
- Line 123: Explain that each group consists of 15 people
- Line 127: The word shoot seems to be more correct. In other cases, it should be corrected

- Table 1, line 161: The p value (0.012) indicates that there is a significant difference between the variables, but your report does not show this issue.
- Tables 1 and 2, the analysis of variance test shows the existence of a difference between the variables, it is suggested to review the results of the post hoc test to compare means in pairs.
- In the methodology section, lines 142 and 143, you indicated that you used the repeated measures analysis of variance test, but the results were not reported.
- In the discussion section, you mentioned the existence of inconsistent research (for example line 187), while the report in the introduction section (line 101) does not confirm this issue.

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

22 Mar 2023

Dear Researchers,

Overall, the research has practical application. however, it needs some revisions as follows:

The Impact of Modeling with the Strategy of Internal and External Attention Focus on the Acquisition and Retention of Basketball Free Throws

Thank you for this research to all authors. There are find some corrections to improve manuscript's quality.

Abstract

(21.62±3.08 years, BMI 23.48±0.99 kg/m²) = revise the m² .

6 sessions were held consisting of 10 attempts per session and a 2-minute rest was placed between each set of efforts.- Can you write more detail statement?

The results showed that there was a significant difference between the free throw performance of the three modeling groups with internal, external, and control focus in the acquisition and delayed retention stage ($P \geq 0.05$). = Make correction in tis sentence.

Also, there was a significant difference between the basketball free throw performance of the three modeling groups with internal, external, and control focus of attention in the recall test ($P \geq 0.05$). = Make correction in tis sentence.

Introduction

119.= Write down the research hypotheses.

Methods

122-125 = This study was performed in three groups (N=15), including 45 female basketball players (Age=21.62±3.08 years, BMI= 23.48±0.99 kg/m², Height=171.11±4.12 Cm, Weight=68.83±4.66Kg) of Takhti Stadium in Tehran. = It is recommended that you correct the incorrect terms in the sentence.

123- How was the sample size determined? Has power analysis been used? Give details.

125- All of the participants were beginners. = How many years have they been doing this sport? Are there any criteria for being a beginner?

134-136 = After grouping, the groups entered the acquisition stage; this stage consisted of 6 sessions every other day, in which 10 attempts were made in each session, and a 2-minute rest was placed between each set of efforts. = How many minutes did the trial sessions last or how many seconds apart were they?

- Demonstrating the procedural design with a schematic chart can improve the quality of the

research.


Results

146-148 = As shown in Figure 1, in the acquisition phase, all three groups of modeling with internal attention-focusing strategy, modeling with external attention focusing strategy, and the control group had significant progress ($p \geq 0.05$). - Can you control this sentence? I doubt the accuracy of the sentence.

166-167= As shown in Table 2, there was a significant difference in the performance of the three groups in the delayed recall test ($P \geq 0.05$). =. Can you correct this sentence?

Discussion

The discussion and limitations are well articulated.

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

3 Apr 2023

Dear Authors,

Thanks for submitting your valuable manuscript to the journal. As a result of review process, we would like to inform you that the review of your manuscript is finished, and based on the editorial decision, you need to do a "Major Revision" on your manuscript. Although research ideas well designed, it needs some major revisions.

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

8 Apr 2023

Dear Researchers,

I am pleased to inform you that your manuscript has been accepted for publication with minor revisions. Please carefully consider the following points for final acceptance:

Please clarify the purpose of the study in the introduction.

Please provide more detail about the methods used in the method section of the abstract.

Please revise the discussion section to address the limitations of the study and the implications of the findings.

please consider the points raised by respected reviewers.

Once you have made the revisions, please upload a revised manuscript to the journal's website.

Thank you for your submission. I look forward to seeing the revised manuscript.

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 express our sincere gratitude to the reviewers and editor for their valuable comments and suggestions, which greatly improved the quality of our manuscript. Their constructive feedback and insightful remarks helped us to refine our research and present it more effectively. We appreciate their time and effort in providing detailed reviews and thoughtful critiques, and we are grateful for their contributions to the scientific community. We would also like to thank the editorial team for their professional support throughout the publication process. Their guidance and assistance were instrumental in bringing this article to fruition.

Reviewer Comment

Thank you for this research to all authors. There are find some corrections to improve manuscript's quality.

Abstract

(21.62±3.08 years, BMI 23.48±0.99 kg/m²) = revise the m² . **Done and highlighted (by table).**

6 sessions were held consisting of 10 attempts per session and a 2-minute rest was placed between each set of efforts.- Can you write more detail statement? **Done and highlighted (by table).**

The results showed that there was a significant difference between the free throw performance of the three modeling groups with internal, external, and control focus in the acquisition and delayed retention stage ($P \geq 0.05$). = Make correction in tis sentence. **Done and highlighted (by table).**

Also, there was a significant difference between the basketball free throw performance of the three modeling groups with internal, external, and control focus of attention in the recall test ($P \geq 0.05$). = Make correction in tis sentence. **Done and highlighted (by table).**

Introduction

119.= Write down the research hypotheses. Done and highlighted (by table).

Methods

122-125 = This study was performed in three groups (N=15), including 45 female basketball players (Age=21.62±3.08 years, BMI=23.48±0.99 kg/m², Height=171.11±4.12 Cm, Weight=68.83±4.66Kg) of Takhti Stadium in Tehran. = It is recommended that you correct the incorrect terms in the sentence. Done and highlighted (by table).

123- How was the sample size determined? Has power analysis been used? Give details. Based on previous studies.

125- All of the participants were beginners. = How many years have they been doing this sport? Are there any criteria for being a beginner? Completely explained

134-136 = After grouping, the groups entered the acquisition stage; this stage consisted of 6 sessions every other day, in which 10 attempts were made in each session, and a 2-minute rest was placed between each set of efforts. = How many minutes did the trial sessions last or how many seconds apart were they? Completely explained

- Demonstrating the procedural design with a schematic chart can improve the quality of the research. Done and highlighted (by table).

Results

146-148 = As shown in Figure 1, in the acquisition phase, all three groups of modeling with internal attention-focusing strategy, modeling with external attention focusing strategy, and the control group had significant progress ($p \geq 0.05$).- Can you control this sentence? I doubt the accuracy of the sentence. Done and highlighted.

166-167= As shown in Table 2 , there was a significant difference in the performance of the three groups in the delayed recall test ($P \geq 0.05$). =. Can you correct this sentence?

Done and highlighted.

Discussion

The discussion and limitations are well articulated. Thank you.

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 Apr 2023

Dear authors,

We appreciate your submission and the effort you made to address the reviewers' comments. However, please note that there are significant weaknesses in the English text of the manuscript. Both statistical tables need to be revised (please review tables similar to the Amiri table). Additionally, detailed explanations of the results in the tables and figures need to be provided.

Furthermore, we suggest changing the title of the manuscript. It seems that a better title could cover your hypotheses. This title "The Impact of Different Attentional Focus Strategies during Modeling on the Acquisition and Retention of Free Throws in Basketball" may be the most appropriate.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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 Editor

We would like to express our sincere gratitude to the reviewers and editor for their valuable comments and suggestions, which greatly improved the quality of our manuscript. Their constructive feedback and insightful remarks helped us to refine our research and present it more effectively. We appreciate their time and effort in providing detailed reviews and thoughtful critiques, and we are grateful for their contributions to the scientific community. We would also like to thank the editorial team for their professional support throughout the publication process. Their guidance and assistance were instrumental in bringing this article to fruition.

Editor Comment

Dear authors,

We appreciate your submission and the effort you made to address the reviewers' comments. However, please note that there are significant weaknesses in the English text of the manuscript. Both statistical tables need to be revised. Additionally, detailed explanations of the results in the tables and figures need to be provided.

Furthermore, we suggest changing the title of the manuscript. It seems that a better title could cover your hypotheses. This title "The Impact of Different Attentional Focus Strategies during Modeling on the Acquisition and Retention of Free Throws in Basketball" may be the most appropriate.

Response: We have done all the points raised by respected editor.

-The English text was completely improved.

-The research title was changed to "The Impact of Different Attentional Focus Strategies during Modeling on the Acquisition and Retention of Free Throws in Basketball"

- detailed explanations of the results in the tables and figures were added.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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 (2)

23 Apr 2023

Dear Ms Rezaei

We are pleased to inform you that your revised manuscript has been accepted for publication. We appreciate the time and effort you put into revising your manuscript, and we believe that the changes you made have significantly improved the quality of your work.

Best regards,
Editor-in-Chief