



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJESBS_13389
Title of the Manuscript:	Does body fat affect performance indicators in youth soccer?
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment Paper can be accepted after the revisions.	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. The language must be revised and grammar and punctuation must be edited. 2. There is practically no discussion part. The authors just gave the results but not discuss their finding with the related literature. The discussion needs to reflect what you found, how it relates to the literature and then what it means physiologically or from a practical aspect and each paragraph should be logical in sequence.	Dear reviewer, Thank you for your letter and constructive comments concerning our manuscript entitled "Does body fat affect performance indicators in youth soccer?". 1. We revised the text regarding language, grammar and punctuation. 2. We added the discussion part separately from the results. Thus we better discuss and relate our findings to the literature.
Minor REVISION comments	1. The introduction needs to be hypothesis driven to allow the reader to see the basis of your hypothesis. It also needs to be clear what the practical question is that you are trying to address. 2. The ethics committee approval must be clarified with name of the committee and approval numbers 3. There is no need to repeat the findings in conclusion part. 4. Any grant funding or conflict of interest needs to be carefully worded.	1. We also added an hypothesis derived from the literature review. 2. The authors of the study are professors of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki and the Kapodestrian University of Athens. 3. We changed the structure of the chapters. 4. No grant funding was used for the current study. Yours sincerely, The authors team
Optional/General comments	Paper can be published after the revisions. Ethics committee approval must be given in details.	