

### **Editor's Comment:**

Here it is my review (attached) after reading the msc. Generally speaking, the article needs to be significantly restructured and possibly needs to go back and take more data in order to be a good fit for this publication (e.g.: multiple regressions). Additionally, whilst I understand that English is not the authors' first language, the standard is poor and many sentences are repetitions. The article needs a proper translation before being able to be published.

The final decision is **not to be accepted**.

Firstly, I would like to appreciate authors' efforts in addressing all comments. Nevertheless, and after reading carefully the all document there are a number of problems and were identified a number of issues with the manuscript, expressing significant concern about both the readability, focus and analysis. These concerns are:

- the **Abstract** (as well as the whole document) should be revised – avoid repetitions (e.g.: conclusions are exactly the same that information provided in discussion);
- the **introduction** should be restructured: explanation provided around the rationale and details around this is very limited and so is suggested to authors to focus on the pertinence of the topic as well on some evidences in the area. Further, it would be useful to also include an explanation of why this overview is particularly of interest on the international level as this is not explicitly stated in the article. Relevant gaps should be identified and related to research questions;
- **Methods:** I do have, however, reservations of a rather severe nature concerning **method**.  
This is maybe the main aspect that should be reframed:
  - *Sample* is not described and therefore needs to be more explicit: please introduce a table (or at least describe) participants' demographic characteristics; further, please introduce inclusion/exclusion criteria as well as how participants were selected; Please justify the sample size adequacy
  - *Instrument:* is this a new questionnaire? If so, the authors should clarify where they based the questions and which methods used for analysing some qualities (content validity, reliability...)
  - *Procedures:* Please ensure all details regarding ethical approval procedures processes are included in the msc, as well instrument application process;
- **Results:** evidences should not be base only in percentages or median (not average) scores; the lack of considering other variables/factors that might have influenced the results; the lack of an indication of how the methods employed would logically lead to the results obtained; although tables are clear, the authors tend to duplicate information in text and so the suggestion is to re-organize tables and delete repetitions - please try to present the fundamental data; hypothesis should be based on recent empirical studies and in this study still lacks theoretical rationales - you need to show to the readers the logical premises based on theories that support the proposed

relationships/theoretical

- **Discussion:** is not supposed to repeat results. With few results to work with it is again hard to ascertain the discussion and how this study will impact future research. The discussion section would be greatly enhanced by adding a limitations sub-section.
- **Conclusion:** the author is suggested to sum up the main conclusions found, based on findings, avoiding generalizations that are not possible within the study. What are the practical implications of this study?

Generally speaking, the article needs to be significantly restructured and possibly needs to go back and take more data in order to be a good fit for this publication. Additionally, The article needs a proper translation before being able to be published.

**Editor's Details:**

Dr. Ana Sofia Pedrosa Gomes dos Santos

Assistant Professor, Faculdade de Motricidade Humana, Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal