Author’s response to reviews

Title: Effectiveness of PUSH notifications from a mobile app for improving the body composition of overweight or obese women. A protocol of a three-armed randomized controlled trial.

Authors:

Alberto Hernández-Reyes (z52heloa@uco.es)
Guillermo Molina-Recio (en1moreg@uco.es)
Rafael Molina-Luque (rafael.moluq@gmail.com)
Manolo Romero-Saldaña (romero@enfermeriadeltabajo.com)
Fernando Cámara-Martos (fernando.camara@uco.es)
Rafael Moreno-Rojas (rafael.moreno@uco.es)

Version: 2 Date: 03 Feb 2020

Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Sirs:

First, we would like to thank the Editor and reviewers the time dedicated to revising the manuscript, their assessments and all the comments made on this work. We agree with most of the observations and are convinced that their contributions have gone towards improving the clarity and scientific value of this research. We apologize for the errors and we have corrected the text as suggested.

To make the changes easier to understand, we have including, when possible, the revised texts in the manuscript as a part of the answers to your comments. We attached the modified version via the web platform.

The authors.
Reviewer reports:

Ping Yu (Reviewer 1)

General comment: I am pleased to see that the writers have taken my initial feedback seriously and have made the relevant changes. Although the study appears to be well-designed and the protocol will be of high interest to the reader community of this journal, the article needs further improvement in structure and presentation before it is up to the standard for publication. I have listed the areas that need to be improved below:

The details are given without context to set up the scene. Even the research aim is not given in the abstract section before going into details.

RESPONSE General comment.

Dear Reviewer,

Thanks again for your work.

We have taken into account each point discussed in this review and have corrected all suggestions.

------

Inappropriate use of words. Example:

A.1. Abstract section. Abstract section. Line 42. 'mandatory' is over-stated. 'Mandatory' by whom? For what purpose?

RESPONSE A.1

Thank you very much for this comment. You are right, the term "mandatory" is not the most appropriate and we have replaced it with "growing interest."

A.2 Page 2. Methods section: Bad use of tense. By the time reading this article, all the experiments have been completed. However, the 'Methods' section on Page 3 Line 51 still present the information as "will be". This needs to be corrected consistently across the article.
RESPONSE A.2

Again, thanks for the comment. Indeed, we have reviewed the manuscript and found incongruities in the tenses. We have completely reviewed the entire text. We regret this mistake.

Unclear sentences or sentences with grammar error, which need to be corrected:


RESPONSE A.3

Thanks for the comment. We agree and have changed the sentence: "A 3-arm clinical trial was established. A series of quantitative and qualitative measures were used to evaluate the effects of self-weighing and the establishment of objectives to be reached concerning the prescription of physical activity"

A.4. Page 5 Line 117. 'the App is in use'.

RESPONSE A.4

We have removed the end of the sentence.

A.5. Page 6. 'However' is not appropriate here.

RESPONSE A.5

We have removed “However”.

A.6. Page 6. Line 145. It would be good to further explain the concept 'health markers'.
RESPONSE A.6

Thanks for the comment. We agree, and we have extended the text: “These measures have been seen to be efficacious in improving health markers, for example, weight management, and blood pressure”.

A.7. Page 7. Line 168. Suggest to change the term "assay" to "trial". As mentioned before, the tense should be changed in describing the study process.

RESPONSE A.7

Thanks for the suggestion. We have changed the term and reviewed all the tenses of the manuscript.

A.8. As this is an article, not a thesis, suggest to drop out all the numbers for the sections of the article.

RESPONSE A.8

Like other points, we appreciate this comment. We have removed the numbering of the sections of the articles.

A.9 Page 8. Line 189 'underage' should be separated into two words.

RESPONSE A.9

We have made this change in the manuscript.

A.10 Line 191. Poor sentence.
RESPONSE A.10

Thanks for the comment. We have replaced the phrase "Further, those women not possessing a Smartphone with an operating system (Android or iOS) and available data connection did not participate in the study" with "Women not possessing smartphones with Android or iOS operating systems and those without available data connections did not participate in the study."

A.11 Figure 1. "criterias" should be "criteria"

RESPONSE A.11

Many thanks for the comment. These misspellings have been corrected.

A.12 The quality of the figures are poor. I can barely distinguish what's in Figures 2 - 4. These need to be substantially improved.

RESPONSE A.12

Thank you very much for your recommendation. The images resolutions have been increased from 72 to 300 dpi.