

Sports Medicine and Rehabilitation

Review Report

Open Access

Article Title: Relationship between Kayaking Movement on Water and Physical Flexibility Among High-School Canoe Sprint Athletes

Reviewer: Steven Ross Murray, Colorado Mesa University, USA

Submission Date: March 30, 2017

Review Status: Revision Required

How to Cite this Report: Steven Ross Murray. Review Report for: Relationship between Kayaking Movement on Water and Physical Flexibility Among High-School Canoe Sprint Athletes [Version 1, Awaiting Peer Review]. Sports Med Rehabil. (2016) 1: 2.1

Review Report

Please note that I added line numbers to the manuscript to make the review more meaningful.

Line 38, is a kayak really called a “canoe boat”? This may be the case, but I am unfamiliar with that delineation.

Line 43, I prefer that the verbs not be split, e.g., easily can tend instead of can easily tend.

Line 45, should low-back pain be hyphenated?

Lines 49 and 50 Perhaps combine the two sentences Several references on the biomechanics of kayaking deal with performance rather than injuries.

Perhaps a figure could be used to display the information listed in lines 67-69 concerning the anatomical structures to make this easier to visualize.

Line 78, the first part of the sentence is written awkwardly.

Line 110, should the significance level be stated as at the 0.05 level?

With respect to lines 113 to 124, please have a statistician confirm the statistics. I am not a statistician and cannot comment on the specifics.

Line 132, perhaps the “it is thus” could just be rewritten thus.

Sports Medicine and Rehabilitation

The information in lines 137 through 143 is important. Perhaps the authors could expand on this information.

Line 157, restate “also may have led” instead of “may have also lead...”

Please elaborate on the information in lines 159 to 165. This seems to be one of the main reasons for conducting the study.

Line 171, the phrase “belonging to their high schools” is awkward. Perhaps this could be rewritten.

Lines 172 and 173, this information needs to be expanded and clarified. Are the authors stating that the inexperience of the subjects may have skewed the results? Perhaps the authors could expand the section and explain why this would occur.

Lines 184 to 189, the authors may want to add a figure explaining the steps with the movement being explained. It is going to be confusing to someone not overly familiar with the sport.

Lines 191 to 194, the conclusion should be expanded to explain precisely what is occurring and why it is important.

Overall, the paper seems to have merit. However, I would like to see several figures added to show precisely how the movements occurred. I believe that having specific figures would help the reader to understand the movements and analyses better.

I would stated that this paper has merit, but needs revisions.

I have read this submission. I believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard, however I have significant reservations, as outlined above.