

Model for Manuscript Review

Research articles

Manuscript title:

PEERJ-81045-Are respiratory muscles' shear modulus and thickness related to endurance and speed in adolescent football players?

Title	
Is it understandable and concise?	() Yes (x) Not
Reflects the content?	() Yes (x) Not
Abstract	
It includes: objectives, methodology, key findings and conclusions?	() Yes (x) Not
Introduction	
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?	(x) Yes () Not
The cited references are current and relevant?	() Yes (x) Not
Methods	
The methods presented are appropriate to achieve the proposed objectives?	(x) Yes () 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?	(x) Yes () Not
The results evaluate the proposed objectives?	(x) Yes () 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?	() Yes (x) Not
The conclusions respond to the objectives?	(x) Yes () Not

General comments:

Title

The title in the form of a question did not clearly present what was done in the manuscript. I suggest that it be redone and placed in the affirmative.

Abstract

It is written in a structured way, however, the methodology is written in a very summarized way which ends up making the findings and conclusions of the article.

The methodology has to be better explained in the methodology.

In the results, absolute and statistical values must be presented to facilitate the understanding of what was done in the study.

Please confirm that the keywords are presented as described in health sciences.

Introduction

The introduction is satisfactorily well written, moving from general to specific.

However, it should initially present a more general approach and gradually address the problem (gap) and then present the objective.

The problem is not well identified, the fact that there are few studies would not be a sustainable problem. There must be a better explanation to support the study.

Goals must come before hypotheses.

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.

I suggest dividing the methodology into topics, design, sample, instruments, procedures and statistics.

The sample should be better explained with the number of subjects presented initially and then present the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Was any statistical calculation or program used to determine the sample size? Please mention. Is there a protocol regarding research in your lab? Please mention.

The instruments need to be better characterized, with manufacturer, city, state, if applicable, and country of manufacture, including the programs for data analysis used. Procedures should be better explained, such as the use of ultrasound.

Statistical treatment should be better detailed in order to better follow what has been done. It would be feasible to review the guidelines for Cohen (1988).

Results

Are presented satisfactorily. However, after being adapted to what is mentioned in the methodology, we believe that some presentations should be modified.

Discussion

Are presented satisfactorily. However, we suggest that you begin the discussion by briefly reaffirming the objectives.

It should reaffirm the objectives and start discussing the results in the chronological order that appear in the item results.

We also suggest that what was mentioned at the beginning of the discussion be placed at the end of it, as the statements found in the first paragraph would be a justification that could precede the limitations of the study.

Conclusion

Are presented satisfactorily. However, in addition to what was mentioned, it should bring some practical applications of the findings, which does not occur.

References

Of the 39 references, 18 are current and 21 have been published for more than five years. I suggest updating the theoretical framework.

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 ()