

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_77362
Title of the Manuscript:	THE IMMEDIATE EFFECT OF STEAM BATH AND SAUNA BATH ON HEART RATE VARIABILITY AND BODY COMPOSITION IN OBESE INDIVIDUALS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Reviewer's General Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is sufficiently robust, technically sound, interesting and will gain a large number of readers 2. I suggest adding the acknowledgments after Completion 3. 2. Please correct in accordance with the rules: The text is presented with 1.5 spacing between lines and the correct one is simple spacing <p>Reviewer comments for abstract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I suggest adapting the methodology present in your abstract because the age group 18 to 32 years old, BMI above 31kg/m2 and the time of steam bath and sauna of 20 minutes used are different from your text. 2. I suggest also adapting your summary results as well as I guide you in your text. <p>Reviewer comments for Introduction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the 6th paragraph of your Introduction you put the objective of your work but this should appear at the end of your Introduction. 2. In the 9th paragraph you quote the abbreviations LF: HF, remember whenever you quote the initials for the first time, it is necessary to put its meaning. <p>Reviewer Comments for Methodology:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dear author, in topic 2.3.1 you mention Table 1 but the content of your table 1 does not correspond to what was cited. 2. Your picture 1 presented was excellent but was not mentioned in your text, I suggest quoting properly. 3. References 196, 197, 198, 199, and 200 cited in your methodology do not appear in your reference list. 4. In topic 2.7.2 it is necessary to put the meaning of the acronyms FFM, TBW and BMR mentioned. <p>Reviewer Comments for Results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Data is well controlled and robust 2. Statistical data were sufficient and appropriate 3. I suggest that the first paragraph of your results form part of your methodology. 4. I advise removing from the first paragraph the sentence: "There were no significant differences presented in tables 6 and 7." Because it doesn't correspond to your work and these tables are not in your work. 5. In the next paragraphs of your results it is important to describe only the results that were statistically significant, the rest is not necessary. 6. The abbreviations SBP, DBP and VLF need to be cited as well as the others, with their respective meanings, in your methodology text in order to make sense for the reader when reading your results. 7. Tables 1 and 2 presented in your results were not cited, you need to cite them correctly in the results. <p>Reviewer Comments for Discussion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The facts and figures are real 2. References 201, 202, 204, 205 and 206 cited are not in your list of references, this needs to be corrected. 3. In your 3rd paragraph you start by saying: "Earlier studies have reported a.....". Is it necessary to reference which studies you refer to in this sentence? <p>Reviewer Comments for References:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dear author, your references, items 5, 6, 7, 10, 27, 28, 29 and 30 do not appear in your text. It is necessary to correct this. 2. I suggest correcting references 11 and 12 of your list because only the links were placed, missing other information about the cited content. <p>Reviewer Comments for Conclusion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The conclusion is supported by the manuscript data. 	

Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Reviewer comments for Introduction: 1. The objective cited at the end of your text is incomplete, I suggest adding the heart rate factor. Reviewer Comments for Discussion 1. I suggest adding the reference to the end of the text of the 2nd paragraph.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	The authors report that the research was evaluated by a local ethics committee	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Jamille Silva Nogueira</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>State University of Campinas-São Paulo, Brazil</i>