

Sports Medicine and Rehabilitation

Review Report

Open Access

Article Title: Ergogenic Effect of Neuromuscular Electrical Stimulation During Rest and Submaximal Exercise

Reviewer: Fabiano Politti, University Nove de Julho, Brazil

Submission Date: July 19, 2017

Review Status: Revision Required

How to Cite this Report: Fabiano Politti. Review Report for: Ergogenic Effect of Neuromuscular Electrical Stimulation During Rest and Submaximal Exercise [Version 1, Awaiting Peer Review]. Sports Med Rehabil. (2017) 1: 5.1

Review Report

Overall this is a very interesting study, However, I see grammar, content and syntax errors that make it far too difficult to judge the merits of your work. It is strongly suggested that the issues raised here be addressed and major revisions made to the work before it is considered for publication.

Specific Comments

Abstract

Line 2: Remove all words: "apparently"

Conclusions: The words: "Viewed in concert", "evoke", impoverish the text

Introduction

"Against this backdrop". Please replace with a more appropriate term.

Statistical analysis

Was the data normality tested?

The use of the paired t test does not seem correct. The use of the paired t test does not seem correct. The data were compared once for each variable. In this way, there is no need for Bonferroni correction.

Results

Nothing to declare

Discussion

The first paragraph of discussion should summarize the main findings of the study and not repeat the same statement previously described in the introduction. Please, provide an answer for a specific hypothesis
The language used in the text is very poor and should be improved. Throughout the text, remove from the text "Paired t-tests".

Sports Medicine and Rehabilitation

There is no need to write: "18 paired t-tests"

The paragraphs are too long. Please reduce the amount of information in the paragraphs. There is a need for the discussion to be more cohesive and to contemplate the results of the present study. It is necessary that the data from this study be compared with data from other studies in a more objective way.

Conclusion

The conclusion is too long. The conclusion should clearly answer the objective of the study.

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.