





200 Meters Freestyle Responses and Strategy Differences During Different Competition Rounds in Youth Competitive Swimmers




Jed Mohamed Tijani¹, Ali Aloui^{2,3}, Ahmed Said Hammed¹, Amal Salhi¹, Abderraouf Ben Abderrahman^{1*}

¹ Higher Institute of Sport and Physical Education of Ksar-Said, University of Manouba, Tunis, Tunisia

² Physical and Health Education Teacher, UAE Ministry of Education, Rashid Bin Humaid Boys' School Cycle 2, Ajman, Dubai, UAE

³ Sharjah Self Defense Sports Club, Sharjah Sports Council, UAE

* Corresponding author email address: benabderrahmanabderraouf@yahoo.fr

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Cain C. T. Clark  Faculty of Health, Education, and Life Sciences, Birmingham City University, Birmingham, B15 3TN, U.K. scain.clark@coventry.ac.uk	Reviewer 1: Masoud Mirmoezi  Department of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran. Email: massoudmirmoezi@live.com Reviewer 2: Hooman Namvar  Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Saveh Branch, Islamic Azad University, Saveh, Iran. Email: hnamvar@iau-saveh.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1 Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

This claim needs more justification or empirical backing. Consider summarizing briefly why the 200m event, in particular, is ideal for this purpose (e.g., energy system balance, race duration).

Include a justification for why both rounds were conducted on the same day and discuss how diurnal variation might affect HR, BLa, or RPE values.

Mention whether the swimmers were familiarized with the scale before the event. If not, this may affect the reliability of self-reported RPE scores.

Clarify whether adjustments for multiple comparisons (e.g., Bonferroni) were used, especially given the multiple dependent variables and groups analyzed.

The grouping of “Top 8 swimmers” and “Other semi-finalists” requires justification beyond performance rank. Provide the rationale for these two comparative groups, and discuss their sample sizes (n=7 and n=6) in terms of statistical power.

Add the sample size (n) used for the correlation matrix. Additionally, note whether correlations were controlled for repeated-measures within-subjects designs, as independence may be violated.

The pacing strategy should be discussed in more depth. Consider including stroke rate or split time data if available, as it would help link effort with strategy more clearly.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

1.2 Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

This sentence is long and convoluted. Break it into two sentences to improve readability and clarify the trade-offs in measurement feasibility (e.g., practicality vs. accuracy).

Specify the expected direction of difference (e.g., higher HR and BLA in semi-finals), as this will make the hypothesis more testable and clear.

It is unclear why only 13 of the 22 were included in the final analysis. This large exclusion (over 40%) must be better explained in terms of impact on generalizability and power.

This classification introduces potential bias. Define whether the group assignment was post hoc or pre-planned and how it influenced the data analysis approach.

The summary lacks specificity. Briefly restate the main findings with actual effect sizes or mean differences to better align with the aims.

This interpretation is plausible but speculative. Add caution or reference supporting research showing performance variability by age or competition level.

There seems to be an error in this comparison. Based on Table 3, RPE for Top 8 was 35.56%, not 16.13%. Double-check the values and revise the sentence accordingly.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.