

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CJAST_123445</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>INTER-SET REST PERIODS AND PERFORMANCE REST PERIOD OPTIMIZATION IN NEAR-MAXIMUM TRAINING ZONES FOR TRAINED WOMEN: IMPLICATIONS FOR PERFORMANCE IN LEG EXTENSION AND LEG PRESS EXERCISES</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>The article with the title "INTER-SET REST PERIODS AND PERFORMANCE REST PERIOD OPTIMIZATION IN NEAR-MAXIMUM TRAINING ZONES FOR TRAINED WOMEN: IMPLICATIONS FOR PERFORMANCE IN LEG EXTENSION AND LEG PRESS EXERCISES" is an interesting article but I think the logical arrangement of the data is missing. Subjects read and signed the informed consent form when informed of the test procedures under Helsinki Declaration.</p> <p><b>Do you have the notice from the Research Ethics Commission? Please specify the number and date when the notice was issued</b></p> <p>„Additionally, it appears that the longer rest periods have acute response patterns similar to 2-minute rest between sets for single-joint exercise, which does not seem to occur with multi-joint exercise. However, the present study is the first to assess the acute response in women on the repetition's performance for multi (i.e., LP) and single-joint (i.e., LE) exercises with near-maximal loads (i.e., 3-RM).”</p> <p>What exactly do you mean when you say acute response?</p> <p>„This data is not supported by our findings with near-maximum loads, due to similar responses in repetition performance observed in both the present [7]. “</p> <p>Can you comment on this statement?</p> <p>„Another pioneer experiment was conducted by Scudese et al.. [7] who compared the effects of different rest periods on bench press performance with 3-RM loads. Sixteen trained men made 4 visits for rest periods with 1-, 2-, 3- and 5-minute between 5 consecutive sets. In their results, Scudese et al. [9] found a higher total number of repetitions with 2-, 3- and 5-minutes vs. 1-minute rest conditions.”</p> <p>It would be better to show comparative data also obtained on groups of women and in the same age group. It seems that in the men's group things are different</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The title seems appropriate</p>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p>I think that limited statistical data should be mentioned in the abstract. They are described in the text.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>It is a relatively solid scientific article from a technical point of view. It has an interesting approach to this topic. However, I think that a larger group of more than 15 people would have been needed to verify the proposed hypotheses.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>There are 23 references, but reference no. 15 is missing There is only 1 article from the last 5 years, 6 from the last 10 years and 16 over 10 years. I think there should be more recent data</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>I do not have this quality</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>„The present study showed a distinct difference between LP and LE, specifically in the 2-minute rest condition, in which declines appear to have been less evident for LE vs. the LP.</p> <p>Can you make the connection between the results of your study and specialized literature? Do you have a bibliographic reference to refer to?</p> <p>Thus, 1- and 2-minute conditions can emphasize anaerobic glycolysis to a greater extent to compensate for incomplete phosphocreatine resynthesis. The greater dependence on anaerobic glycolysis is associated with the accumulation of H<sup>+</sup> which decreases the pH of intracellular fluid. The resulting effect is afferent feedback from chemoreceptors and muscle nociceptors that are associated with an increase in perceived exertion [22].”</p> <p>This information was useful in the introduction part.</p> <p>„The complex physiology involved on muscle recovery can somehow be evaluated using this type of scale, and when well familiarized by the user, it has the potential give immediate feedback between RE practitioners and strength coaches that can use this study data to make adjustments in the prescription of rest periods between sets.”</p> <p>Is this your conclusion or there is data in the specialized literature?</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer's comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author's comment</b> (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)</p>
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Silisteanu Sinziana Calina</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Stefan cel Mare” University of Suceava, Romania</b></p>