TO THE EDITOR: I must thank professor Noakes for the debate and—in contrast to myself—his brilliant linguistic argumentation. But I can only summarize the verdict from our excellent colleagues in exercise physiology that the final result in this unrandomized review is an overwhelming “thumbs down” for the CGM (see Ref. 1).

I have just one comment not seen anywhere in the debate. If the aim of a Central Governor mechanism was to prevent the heart from myocardial ischemia during maximal exercise, why use a complicated system of “peripheral” regulations—a system we know can fail in different environments? A more secure system for prevention would have been concentrated directly on the initiation of the heart beat. There are direct and indirect possibilities through the autonomic nervous system or even an intramyocardial feedback system. But there are no such signs. Therefore, the overwhelming results from many observations are that the healthy heart is the bottleneck for $\text{VO}_{2\text{max}}$ with good reserve capacity of the heart muscle without risk of heart failure and hypoxic damage.
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