

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports</a>                  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_AJARR_97795  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Effective Ultramarathon Pacing Strategies on Road and Trail; A Narrative review |
| Type of the Article      | Review 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:

(<https://www.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

|   | Reviewer's comment  | Author's comment (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) |
|---|---|---|
| <b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments<br>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)<br>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br>(If not please suggest an alternative title)<br>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b><br>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b><br>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b><br>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b><br><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b> | The concept of the manuscript is very emerging in the context of Ultramarathon Pacing Strategies.<br>1. Lack of strong controlled methodological backup has been found in the manuscript, including details inclusion criteria, exclusion criteria, articles assessments etc.<br>2. Deficiency of scientific explanations under each heading is found in the manuscript and technically more detailed information should be given under each outcomes.<br>3. Outcomes of the study is not generalized properly, please reframe it with much more scientific explanations. |   |
| <b>Minor REVISION</b> comments<br>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>   |   |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments  |   |   |

### PART 2:

|  | Reviewer's comment  | Author's comment (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) |
|--|---|---|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) |   |

### Reviewer Details:

|                                  |                                 |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Name:                            | Anup De                         |
| Department, University & Country | Visva-Bharati University, India |