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Reviewer's report:

The paper theme is interesting and acceptable.

Line 53, change cm2 to cm².

Lines 77-79, "that WB-EMS offers results similar to those obtained with the local EMS both for the rehabilitation of injuries [10, 11], i.e., exercise for individuals with illnesses [12-14], and for strength training in healthy subjects [4]." I know that the aim of this paper is on healthy subjects; however, general information about secondary effects of electrical stimulation as decrease in spasticity (subjects with neurological disorders) may be inserted in introduction.

Table 3 and 4, change "cronaxia" (chronaxie), for "on time of pulse". The term "duty cycle" was wrong employed, duty cycle in the ration between the on and off time of pulse, express in percentage (%) (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Duty_cycle) as show in line 519: "Wirtz et al. [17] of soccer players, a strength work and a duty cycle of 83.3%". E.g. in table 4, the work of Miguel Ángel De la Cámara 2018 appear "continuous" and "1 Hz", duty cycle continuous is 100% of time on = 0 Hz. Continuous (no repetition) is different of constant (have repetition). Others parameters as rise and decay time were not indicated.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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