

REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: **“EFFECTS OF PLYOMETRIC TRAININGS ON UPPER EXTREMITY ANAEROBIC POWER AND SHOT SPEED IN MALE HANDBALL PLAYERS”**

Corresponding Author: Mahmut Alp  
Email: [mahmutalp@sdu.edu.tr](mailto:mahmutalp@sdu.edu.tr)

Doi: 10.19044/ejes.v8no2a60

Peer review:  
Reviewer 1: Abdullah Aydin  
Kirsehir Ahi Evran University, Turkey

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Published: 30.06.2021

## ***EJES Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: EJES promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

***EJES editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands EJES out from the crowd!***

Date Manuscript Received: April 9, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: April 14, 2021
Manuscript Title: EFFECTS OF PLYOMETRIC TRAININGS ON UPPER EXTREMITY ANAEROBIC POWER AND SHOT SPEED IN MALE HANDBALL PLAYERS	
Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	

**Evaluation Criteria:**

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	4
<i>The title is partially clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	3
<i>This (methods) should be checked and must be written.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	3
<i>There are few spelling mistakes.</i>	
<i>These:</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “...50 – 60 mi”, (Content of Handball Training), this should be checked.</li> <li>• “...the groups; The difference...”, (Discussion), this should be checked.</li> </ul>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	3
<i>This section should be explained based on the literature.</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	3
<i>The body of the paper is partially clear and does not contain errors.</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The citations used for the text should be checked (in the body of the paper).</li> </ul>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	3
<i>The conclusions or summary are partially accurate and supported by the content.</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These parts should be checked.</li> </ul>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	

The references are **partially** comprehensive and appropriate.

- The references are quite poor. In 17 references, we can find two with five years or less.

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	<b>X</b>
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

1. **The abstract** needs to be restructured so that it is suitable for scientific research and not in a form suitable for a thesis.
2. **Introduction** to the study needs to be expanded and more studies in order to fully reflect the research data.
3. Add more previous studies that dealt with the same topic.
4. **Re-division of the study methodology** in a manner consistent with a scientific research rather than a thesis.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

The topic is **promising** but the paper is not substantial as it is.

- I think that the last version of the paper can be published. Some corrections are needed. These are marked on the **Draft Word**.