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**Compulsory REVISION comments**

- Calculating individual Pearson correlations between interacting variables are not as robust and may not be statistically valid, due to possible inflation of Type I error. The authors should try some variable modelling, such as exploratory factor analysis (because you have already defined your variables), possibly followed by a confirmatory factor analysis. Either way, the exploratory factor analysis would also generate correlations between each variable.

- Has the SCWBS been validated? If so, how? Is the purpose of the current study to validate the SCWBS (lines 124-135)? If so, why don’t you ever mention it again throughout the paper? Is this a valid instrument? What are your conclusions about the SCWBS as an instrument?

- Has its reliability been assessed? If so, how?

**Minor REVISION comments**

- The English must be improved throughout the entire paper. Some examples follow:
  - Line 56: Clarify this sentence. It is grammatically awkward.
  - Lines 65-66: “as it does not require a lot of space and only a few players.”
  - Line 80: “trained researchers. Then, for another…”
  - Line 83: Delete “as”
  - Line 123: “translated to Malaysian through…”
  - Line 124: Unclear: What does “back-to-back translation” mean?
  - Line 232: “Besides that, they are very physically active.”
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