Review of: "Physiological Adaptation to Altitude: A Comparison of Fast and Slow Ascents to 5,300 m Above Sea Level"

Sonja Radakovic[1]

1 University of Defence

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

To authors:

The article deals with an interesting problem.

However, we found some major disadvantages regarding the methodology, which need to be corrected before final approval.

1. The authors should provide a power study test and a test for the minimal sample size. This is necessary for the choice of appropriate statistical tests and correct statistical conclusions.
2. The authors should provide a normality test analysis.
3. In the case of using the median as the central tendency value, or the IQR, the authors have to use non-parametric statistical tests.
4. The authors should describe the type of test used for the analysis of the correlation between age or gender and outcomes.
5. The authors should declare the software package program for statistical analysis.
6. In Table 1, the units should be correctly presented (km instead of m; number and percentage of affected persons).
7. The authors should be precise regarding the diagnosis of peripheral oedema and polyuria – were they self-reported or determined by a physician; if so, what criteria were used.
8. In Methods, authors should avoid personal presentation: instead of “WE,” “OUR,” etc., they should use “THE SUBJECTS,” “THE INVESTIGATED GROUP,” etc. Also, descriptions of trips, hotels, porters, etc., should be avoided.

To the editor:

Thank you for considering me as one of your reviewers.

The article “Physiological adaptation to altitude: a comparison of fast and slow ascents to 5,300 m above sea level” deals with the interesting problem of adaptation to high altitude regarding the development of symptoms of acute mountain sickness. The authors measured oxygen saturation and heart rate in two groups of climbers – first 13 who climbed for 3000 m over 8 days, and the other 7 who climbed the same altitude in 4 days.

However, we found some major disadvantages regarding the methodology, which need to be corrected before final approval.

1. The authors should provide power study tests and tests for minimal sample size. This is necessary for the choice of appropriate statistical tests and correct statistical conclusions.
2. The authors should provide a normality test analysis.
3. In case of using the median as the central tendency value, or the IQR, the authors have to use non-parametric statistical tests.
4. The authors should describe the type of test used for the analysis of correlation between age or gender and outcomes.
5. The authors should declare the software package program for statistical analysis.
6. In Table 1, the units should be correctly presented (km instead of m; number and percentage of affected persons).
7. The authors should be precise regarding the diagnosis of peripheral oedema and polyuria – were they self-reported or determined by a physician; if so, what criteria were used.
8. In Methods, authors should avoid personal presentation: instead of “WE,” “OUR,” etc., they should use “THE SUBJECTS,” “THE INVESTIGATED GROUP,” etc. Also, descriptions of trips, hotels, porters, etc., should be avoided.

Considering the importance of the disadvantages mentioned above, the article needs to be thoroughly corrected according to the given instructions.

Best regards,

Sonja Marjanovic Radakovic