



Maximizing Endurance: Exercise Physiology's Role in Elevating Athletic Performance

Claudio Andre Barbosa de Lira^{1*}

¹ Faculty of Physical Education and Dance, Federal University of Goiás, Goiânia, Brazil

* Corresponding author email address: claudioandre@ufg.br

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Parvin Babaei Professor of Physiology, Gilan University of Medical Sciences, Rasht, Iran p_babaei@gums.ac.ir	Reviewer 1: Raghad Mimar Assistant Professor, Biomechanics and Sport injury, Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran. Email: rmimar@khu.ac.ir Reviewer 2: SeyedMohammad Hosseini Assistant Professor, Health and Sports Rehabilitation Department, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran. Email: moh_hosseini@sbu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1 Reviewer 1

Date: 03 June 2023

Reviewer: Thank you for your great article. A more detailed exposition of its arguments, supported by robust evidence and a clearer structure, will significantly improve its impact.

The article's scope and purpose need to be more explicitly defined. Clarify the primary objectives and contributions of the commentary.

Insufficient integration of relevant literature, particularly in supporting arguments. Enhance the integration of current and pertinent literature to support the arguments made.

Some arguments lack depth and require further development. Expand on key arguments to provide a more thorough analysis.

Several key concepts are not clearly defined or explained. Clearly define and explain all key concepts to enhance reader comprehension.

There is a lack of evidence to substantiate certain claims made in the article. Provide empirical or theoretical evidence to support major claims.

The discussion of the implications of the commentary's findings is limited.

Elaborate on the implications of the findings for the field.

The overall structure and flow of the article can be improved for better readability. Revise the structure to ensure a logical and coherent flow of ideas.

Excessive use of technical language and jargon which may not be accessible to all readers. Simplify language where possible to enhance accessibility.

The author uploaded the revised document.

1.2 Reviewer 2

Date: 08 June 2023

Reviewer: The article has the potential to make a significant contribution; however, it requires minor revisions to address issues related to argumentation, depth of analysis, and clarity. By making these revisions, the article will be better positioned to effectively communicate its message and contributions to the field.

The context in which the commentary is set is not sufficiently described. Provide a more comprehensive background to the topic under discussion.

Inconsistencies are present in some of the arguments. Ensure consistency and coherence in the argumentation throughout the article.

The analysis lacks depth in certain sections, particularly in the examination of complex concepts. Deepen the analysis in sections where the exploration of concepts is superficial.

Limited reference to current developments or recent research in the field. Incorporate recent developments or studies to reinforce the commentary's relevance.

The article exhibits a bias towards certain perspectives. Present a more balanced view by considering alternative perspectives.

The conclusions drawn are not clearly articulated. Clarify the conclusions to reflect the commentary's key insights and findings.

Formatting inconsistencies are present, affecting the article's professional appearance. Adhere to consistent formatting as per the journal's guidelines.

The author uploaded the revised document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.