

Review for PeerJ

Title: Analysis of professional soccer players in competitive match play based on submaximum intensity periods (#68211)

1. Basic reporting

Clear and unambiguous, professional English used throughout.

Yes

Literature references, sufficient field background/context provided.

Yes

Professional article structure, figures, tables. Raw data shared.

Yes

Self-contained with relevant results to hypotheses.

Yes

2. Experimental design

Original primary research within Aims and Scope of the journal.

Manuscript in the field of performance analysis, sports science

Research question well defined, relevant & meaningful. It is stated how research fills an identified knowledge gap.

Yes

Rigorous investigation performed to a high technical & ethical standard.

Yes

Methods described with sufficient detail & information to replicate.

Rather yes

3. Validity of the findings

Impact and novelty not assessed. Meaningful replication encouraged where rationale & benefit to literature is clearly stated.

The research brings interesting information to the literature

All underlying data have been provided; they are robust, statistically sound, & controlled.

Rather yes

Conclusions are well stated, linked to original research question & limited to supporting results.

Yes

4. Additional comments

The topic is not very revealing, but it is in line with the current trends in the analysis of performance in football

In the abstract, in the method section, line 37, there is no sentence informing you which statistical analysis you used to present the results. Please add

Introduction is well-written and justified

Methods. Line 91, Azerbaijan Premier League is the highest level of competition in this country?

Line 99, One of the biggest my concerns regarding division of playing positions. Midfielders have different task when playing in central or in wide side of the pitch. this can distort the data analysis

In this type of analysis, the most common division is into five playing positions, not four

Line 102-106 fine

Results. Line 159-161 First sentence of the results is misleading, I can not understand second part. Please clarify

Discussion. Line 241-248 I appreciate the complexity of the analysis, although the main findings are not very new, in part they were to be expected

Line 247 "attractor" this word is misleading, please change, the same situation with this word in last line of abstract

Line 252-261 Authors should not at all compare results across disciplines because it makes no sense. I suggest to look for other references or write that in football such an analysis has not yet been carried out and these results have no reference in the literature

Line 263-268 I expect this result to be better / more thoroughly discussed

Line 270-282 it seems reasonable to refer here to various tactical systems, e.g. that in the system in which the examined team played 5 playing positions were not specified

Line 329-345 I would suggest authors to combine loose thoughts into broader paragraphs to eliminate short paragraphs that consist of one sentence. This rule should not normally be used (e.g. see the last two sentences / paragraphs in the discussion)

Conclusion and practical application. Legible and a bit short as presented in the main findings in the manuscript