

Editor's Comment:

- **Abstract:** Consider that this section should very briefly outline the following information providing the reader a background of the study – it needs a first sentence for this matter

- **Introduction:** A greater attention should be given to the background and theory supporting this research, strengthening the importance of such study and therefore could be restructured: it 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; avoid repetitions – proof throughout; further, if the factors that impact participation are already identified what is the contribution of this study to science?

- **Methods:** According to journal guidelines it should be given adequate information to allow the experiment to be reproduced, and so further details on the methodology (e.g.: sampling, procedures, instrument, data analysis...) will strengthen the study:

Sample: need to be more explicit: please introduce a table (or at least describe) with participants' demographic characteristics; further, please introduce inclusion/exclusion criteria as well as how participants were selected; Please justify the sample size adequacy;

Instrument: The author is invited to think on reader perspective: imagine that other researcher wants to replicate the study – he/she/they have to know the instrument: how it is constituted? There are no clear data about the instrument/interview and observation grid (was there any)? the observation was done in Biology classes for a particular reason? What were the instruments? How many items? How was the administration and classification guidelines? who observed? How was done the application of the instrument...? How was done the interpretation of data? Is this a validated questionnaire? How was done the application of the instrument...face-to-face or...? What was an average duration of the interview? All these specific guidelines will help readers to understand the interview used...I understand the tension between space and content, but it would be good to provide some brief information on psychometric properties or at least to some basic procedures for testing reliability; All these specific guidelines will help readers to understand the instrument used...

Procedures: Please ensure all details regarding ethical approval procedures processes are included in the msc, as well instrument application process; further, authors should provide a statement to confirm that the participants has given their informed consent;

□ **Results:** Authors are encouraged to specify all procedures and analyses steps conducted: how was done the observation data interpretation? There were how many coders/observers... was there any coding tree? Categories? If so, how were they defined? Codes were clustered by similarity, and a theme was identified and described based on each cluster or how was the saturation process? About the interview validation: experts revise? was a focus group or...? It is no clear how instruments/methods achieved such results; I have some doubts about the reliability and validity of the process followed.

Tables and Figures: authors are suggested to re-think the number of tables and figures – some of the information could be presented in same table;

□ **Discussion:** I suggest authors to review their arguments that should be presented and evidence-supported based and be cautious with generalizations. The study appears poorly supported by the data and it lack of other evidences confront as well some deep in of this study results – e.g.: what reasons the authors pointed out for a tendency to passive participation? At some point the authors state: “thisn finding revealed that the definition of classroom participation is understood by students” – in what data are authors based for this statement?; it should also provide detailed strengthen the discussion about findings: what is the worth-value of such a study and how findings could be “used” for teachers of others countries? What is the new evidences that this work brings to scientific and real community?

□ **Conclusion:** Usually, the finding highlighted here relates to the primary outcome measure; however, other important or unexpected findings should also be mentioned. It is also customary, but not essential, for the authors to express an opinion about the theoretical or practical implications of the findings, or the importance of their findings for the field. Thus, the conclusions may contain three elements: The primary take-home message; The additional findings of importance; The perspective.

Writing and Grammar: The writing is also very repetitive many places and there are also numerous grammatical errors; authors needed to use a proof editing service to result in a manuscript worth of peer review (e.g.: the purpose of interview was to mine identify the factors).

Editor’s Details:

Dr. Ana Sofia Pedrosa Gomes dos Santos
Assistant Professor, Faculdade de Motricidade Humana, Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal