



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJMMR_17374
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effects of a Delay Following Warm-up on the Heart Rate Response to Sudden Strenuous Exercise
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Abstract To rewrite the sentence ... It has previously been shown to result in electrocardiograph (ECG) abnormalities indicative of myocardial ischemia when not preceded by a warm-up.</p> <p>To define ...SSE (in the first time in the abstract)</p> <p>Line 65 – Methods The number of participants in the investigation is very small. I suggest to increase the number of participants or to alter the title of the study, as “Preliminary findings....</p> <p>Line 239- Reference section There is a very important and serious problem. In general, the references are not recent. I suggest to include recent references.</p> <p>Ethical Issue: Yes, but the authors have justified.</p>	<p>The abstract has been reworded.</p> <p>The definition of SSE has been added to the first appearance in the abstract.</p> <p>We have addressed the comment on sample size in the conclusion (see below).</p> <p>We agree that more recent references are needed, and we have added in this regard. However, we prefer not to remove the original references (e.g. Barnard 1970s) due to the significant findings and relevance of these references. However, we have also added some more work that is newer than the original work, (Chesler et al 1997). More recent work that this in the area is lacking.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Lines 14-16 – to rewrite the sentence ...“The cardiovascular responses to the initial onset of exercise including increased cardiac output [1], stroke volume</p>	<p>This has been re-written.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>as a result of increased venous return [2] and heart rate (HR) due to sympathetic stimulation and circulating catecholamines [3] have been well documented. “</p> <p>Line 18 – to include a reference ... fashion (reference).</p> <p>Line 27 - ...colleagues (to add the number of the reference)</p> <p>Line 125- The authors must introduce the Table 1.</p> <p>Line 164- to include a reference in ...expected (reference),...</p>	<p>Line 18: This sentence had been reworded to reflect that this is a commonly accepted model in exercise physiology that the cardiac responses to exercise are adequate to meet oxygen demand in aerobic work. The following sentence reflects that this is not the case in high-intensity (non-aerobic) work, in which the anaerobic metabolism is therefore heavily recruited.</p> <p>Line 27: This reference number has been added.</p> <p>Table 1 has been introduced.</p> <p>We have removed the statement “as expected”. The reviewer correctly suggests that this exercise is not a progressive increase in intensity where such a response might be expected.</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>I think that this study is very interesting, but it has two problems: the number of participants and the references (it is necessary to delete old references and to include recent references).</p> <p>I suggest to change the title due to the small number of participants to “Preliminary results”</p>	<p>We have added a newer reference, but as mentioned above, we prefer to keep the original references as they represent original and relevant work in the area.</p> <p>We agree that the small sample size is a relevant comment from the reviewer, but we prefer to include this as a limitation in the conclusion, rather than altering the manuscript title.</p>