

Model for Manuscript Review
Research articles

Manuscript title:

PEERJ 75068 - Characteristics and usefulness of trunk muscle endurance tests on the Roman chair

Title	
Is it understandable and concise?	(x) Yes () Not
Reflects the content?	(x) Yes () Not
Abstract	
It includes: objectives, methodology, key findings and conclusions?	() Yes (x) Not
Introduccion	
The investigation was carried out in a suitable theoretical structure?	() Yes (x) Not
Clear leaves the questions you want to answer and objectives of the work?	() Yes (x) Not
The cited references are current and relevant?	() Yes (x) Not
Methods	
The methods presented are appropriate to achieve the proposed objectives?	() Yes (x) Not
The selection and composition of the sample are adequately described?	() Yes (x) Not
The data collection process and the tools used are described clearly?	() Yes (x) Not
The statistical analysis and the research design appropriate?	() Yes (x) Not
Results	
The presentation of the results clear?	() Yes (x) Not
The main results are highlighted without the inclusion of interpretation and comparisons?	() Yes (x) Not
The results evaluate the proposed objectives?	() Yes (x) Not
Tables and figures are properly numbered, labeled and explained?	() Yes (x) Not
Discussion and Conclusion	
The results are discussed based on the literature?	(x) Yes () Not
Author's interpretations show the safety and soundness?	() Yes (x) Not
The limitations of the work are presented?	(x) Yes () Not
The conclusions of the study are presented?	(x) Yes () Not
The conclusions respond to the objectives?	() Yes (x) Not

General comments:

Title

Are presented satisfactorily.

Abstract

I consider the abstract to be relatively well written, however, it would be necessary to insert some absolute values, in addition to the statistical values. I also suggest that the last part suggesting other studies be taken from the abstract and that the methodology be better detailed.

Introduction

The introduction is not starting from general to specific. It should initially present a more general approach and gradually address the problem (gap) and then present the objective.

The problem must be better identified. The introduction should focus on the proposed test construct.

Please make a link between the problem and the proposed objective.

It would be indicated that the study hypotheses to be answered were presented.

Methods

It should present more clearly the design of the study. A CONSORT or time line, should be presented in order to get a better view of the study design.

The sample should be better explained with the number of subjects presented initially and then present the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Which program or reference was used to arrive at the number of participants. Some statistical program was used. Why this number of evaluated.

The methodology is confusing, it suggests that it be divided into topics, design, sample, instruments, procedures and statistics.

The place of insertion of figures and tables must be pointed out in the text.

The figures must meet ethical standards and a stripe must be placed as a way of preserving the identity of the participants.

It was mentioned that there would be a five-minute, 48-hour break for recovery. Please put a reference so that this rest time is enough for the proposed.

The instruments and procedures must be referenced from other studies.

If a new instrument was proposed, there should be a topic regarding the construct of this instrument to justify its use.

Statistical treatment should be better detailed in order to better follow what has been done. I suggest reviewing the design and statistical analysis for possible validation of said test and also consulting Cohen (1988).

Results

As mentioned earlier, as the design and statistics are not properly described, the results end up being poor. To use a new instrument, some parameters must be respected. I suggest that the results be reviewed in view of the mentioned in the methodology.

Discussion

Despite the discussion being relatively well written, the aforementioned problems do not allow the results presented to be enough to give an answer and credibility to the evaluations.

I suggest that the methodology be adequate and from there that the studies presented in the discussion are used, solidifying the answer.

Conclusion

In view of what was mentioned in the methodology, the conclusion ends up being weakened. It would also be important to focus more on the practical applications of the findings.

References

Please review the formatting of references. Of the 24 references, 11 are current and 13 are more than five years old. please update.

Overview

The manuscript presented addresses a relevant research topic.
It would be advisable to do a general review.

Specific comments and suggestions:

Outcome evaluation

- Accept unchanged ()
- Accepted with minor changes ()
- Accepted with major changes (x)
- Rejected ()