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Reviewer's report:

The pages in this manuscript were numbered form 1 to 31. The authors should look at the SPIRIT and CONSORT guidelines to improve their manuscript.

1. Page 2, line 44. State who the two were that were intended to be blind. Double is not specific enough. Also P 7, l 165. Also P 10, l 254.

2. P 1, l 58. Since [or] logically includes [and], delete [and/]. Also P 14, l 358. Also P 22, l 535.

3. P 1, l 60. Specify the date format and include the date the first patient was randomized since l 539 states that randomization has been started.

4. P 3, l 83. Rewrite to make recent more specific: [Cycling-based endurance training studies in 2009 and 2011 have …].

5. P 4, l 100. What about before ingestion?


7. P 8, l 201. Insert spaces between all inequalities and numbers, rewrite as [> 4].
   P 14, l 353 and 354. Also P 15, l 381. Also P 16, l 391. Also P 21, l 522.

8. P 8, l 210. What method is used to determine optimality?

9. P 9, l 234 to 236. Should this not wait until the practitioner responds?

10. P 10, l 247. What is the allocation ratio? Under what conditions will the blind be broken if any? What is JAB’s role in the study?

11. P 11, l 267. How do you ensure compliance? Will it be measured?

12. P 11, l 276. These sessions should be recorded along with and co-interventions and contamination.

13. P 13, l 313. Will consumed water be recorded?

14. P 13, l 324. Will the results be recorded?

15. P 14, l 341. Is provision being made for both male and female subjects?

16. P 14, l 358. Is there a reference for the method for this bias adjustment? If yes, please include.

17. P 15, l 385. Is there software that will do this? Cite it.


19. P 16, l 409. Delete [systematic] since all bias is systematic.
20. P 18, l 456. What about the 3rd one?
21. P 19, l 462. Replace [significant] by [important]. This does not appear to be statistically determined.
22. P 19, l 483. What if they do? Will it be recorded?
23. P 20, l 500. Are there any other measures planned?
24. P 20, l 503. What software was used for this sample size? Cite it if used. Why was the stratification by gender not considered?
25. P 21, l 521. Suggest inserting [post-] between [by] and [stratification].
26. P 21, l 522. Replace [±] by either [,] or [;]. The plus and minus signs are no longer used between a mean and standard deviation as they suggest the reader should be able to add and subtract the standard deviation from the mean to create some numbers that are sensible; when indeed they are not.
28. P 22, l 534. Should [interactions] not be [differences]?
29. P 23, l 559. Insert the grant number if there is one. Also does [Armor Proteins] have any role in the study design, management, analysis or approval of what is submitted for results presentation or publication? Make a statement about this.
30. A random sample of R(efERENCE)s was chosen to check accuracy of citations. P 24, R 8, l 591. Insert [(16)] after [589]. The issue numbers make the Rs easier to find for a reader.
31. P 25, R 11, l 600. Trials likes to cite the first 30 authors before using [et al], so fill in more authors.
32. P 25, R 12, l 605. Insert [(11)] after [40].
33. P 25, R 13, l 609. Insert [(3)] after [94].
34. P 25, R 15, l 616. Insert [(15)] after [586].
35. P 25, R 16. What is the current status of this R?
37. P 27, R 34, l 687. Insert [(3)] after [116].
38. P 27, R 37, l 696. Insert [(10)] after [2].
40. P 29, R 54, l 749. Rewrite as [Writing Group].
41. P 29, R 59 appears to be correct.
42. P 29, R 62, l 771. Add [Correction 2003;4:104.]
43. P 31. Add the stratification by gender after the second box before the randomization.