Response to Reviewer 2 Comments

Thank you very much, your comments have helped us to improve the manuscript. We hope we have adequately responded to your suggestions.

Point 1: The most difficult challenge to the publication of this manuscript, in my opinion, is the issue of innovation and scholarly merit. Another reason is that the authors appear to have failed to adequately demonstrate the necessity and significance of the PNES e-version. Finally, the writing style needs to be refined. The focus on the research question in the introduction and the expansion of the discussion section are likely important parts that can be improved. Setting aside the reasons for writing, the most challenging thing is probably articulating the academic contribution and innovation of this research.

Perhaps the following studies can serve as an inspiration and foundation for everyone.
(1) doi.org/10.2196/16197
(2) doi.org/10.2196/24466
(3) doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0233891
(4) doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17134844 [this article has been cited].

The following information may be useful for the author to consider when revising the manuscript.

I personally and sincerely suggest that the authors make major modifications to the introduction and discussion sections.
Response 1: We thank you for your great involvement in the manuscript, we believe that everything you indicate is very important. We have taken into account the references you indicate and we have tried to solve your suggestions one by one and we tried to improve the article as much as possible.

Point 2: Writing style requires extensive revision, particularly in terms of paragraph logic and sentence structure. The lack of logic and expression in the lines can easily cause distress to the reader and does not help the authors demonstrate their innovative ideas. The manuscript also appears to have many errors in the use of connecting words or to be illogical.
Response 2: Thanks for the suggestion, we tried to improve the logic structure. We also want to use an English reviewer.

Abstract section
Point 3: Line 14. Personally, I believe that the authors should be encouraged to write the background from a professional standpoint, rather than relying on the current lack of digital version scales at PNSE.
Response 3: We thank the reviewer for his/her comment. The abstract beginning was changed: "Motivation is an important field in sport because it is related to the satisfaction, psychological well-being, or adherence to sport. The Psychological Need Satisfaction in Exercise Scale (PNSE) is one of the questionnaires that assess motivation from the Self-Determination Theory. Online tools are growing because of the advantages that they offer. PNSE has been validated in different populations, but never in its digital version."

Point 4: Line 15. It is recommended to add "the" before "present study". Line 16 "PNSE", "MenPas platform", and Line 25 "Psychometric Properties" are the same.
Response 4: The text has been changed.

Point 5: Line 15. "Therefore," should be removed.

Response 5: The text has been changed.

Point 6: Line 16-18. "A total of 1050 platform's users, between 18-58 years who practice regular physical-sports activity participated in present study" might be considered to be rewritten as "The current study included 1050 platform users aged 18 to 58 who engage in regular physical-sports activity."

Response 6: The text has been replaced.

Point 7: Line 18-20. "A Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) of the 18-item model was performed, and gender and sport type invariance was tested." In addition, Confirmatory Factor Analysis, the first letter appears to be capitalized unnecessarily.

Response 7: The first letters have been changed.

Point 8: Line 24-25. Except for the issue of term capitalization, the conclusion is not very readable. Perhaps the authors should reconsider revising it.

Response 8: The text has been changed: "The PNSE digital version shows adequate the Psychometric Properties and it could improve the data collection process in future investigations."

Introduction section

As a scholarly study, the manuscript is not clearly "problematic" (no offense intended).

Perhaps the authors provided too much background information, and the most important aspect of this study (psychometric properties) lacks direct and focused description. This is very unfortunate.

Point 9: Line 34-36. "There are a several theoretical models, however, in last decades the Theory of Self-Determination (SDT) has been used as motivation and personality theory who considers that people can lead their behavior in a level of controlled or autonomous way."

The terminology is unambiguous. However, it may be easy for the reader to attempt to flee.

Response 9: The text has been changed: "There are a several theoretical models that study sport motivation. One of them is the Theory of Self-Determination (SDT) which considers that people can direct their behavior in a level of controlled or autonomous way."

Point 10: Line 122-123. “The results did not show a strong fit for both groups and indicate that further research is needed to be able to perform studies comparing samples.” Perhaps it would be better to rewrite it as the following sentence? “The results did not show a strong fit for both groups, indicating that more research is required to conduct studies comparing samples.”

Response 10: The text has been changed.

Point 11: Line 130-132. I recommend merging into the previous paragraph. Could we reconsider rewriting it as “Thus, although the questionnaire has been validated in sport in the Spanish population, its online version has never been validated, and the invariance between sports (individual and team sports) has never been tested.”

Response 11: The text has been replaced.

Point 12: Line 133-134. “was the validation of the online PNSE, 133 placed on MenPas platform” to“was to validate the online PNSE, which was placed on the MenPas platform”

Response 12: The text has been replaced.

Line 146- 151.

2.1 participants.

Point 13: 1) It is suggested that the recruitment process, inclusion criteria (sampling method), and demographic information (as stated in line 168 "sport practiced, gender, age, studies, profession") be reported in better detail. Are all participants of Spanish origin? Given that the authors claim that this study was conducted on "athletes," more information about the participants' characteristics may be useful. Because the PNES study will be of interest to exercise psychology and public health professionals, the authors should have defined this section more clearly. Undoubtedly, Wilson et al. (2006 IJSP) originally developed the PNSE based on students, which clearly illustrates the subject information (Study 1: 426 students; Study 2: 581 university students).

Response 13: The text has been changed: “A total of 1050 (694 female) Spanish MenPas 1.0 platform users participated in present study. The ages varied from 18 to 58 years (M = 23. 82, SD = 5. 75). The 82.6% completed higher education, the 13% has middle studies, 7% average studies, 1.4% had primary education and 2.3% had no education. All participants were regular physical-sports activity practitioners that usually practice who usually practice sport an average of 6 hours per week (M = 6.10; SD = 4.46). The sports practiced by the participants are varied, being individual (69.3%) or team (30.7%) sports.”

Point 14: 2）To what extent do different educational backgrounds influence the dependent variable?

Response 14: The main objective of our study is to validate the e-PNSE. We consider your suggestion, and we think that it is an interesting point that could be studied in the future but not in this paper. However, a paragraph has been added to the conclusion stating your suggestion: “Finally, it would be interesting to further analyze the different variables involved in the study, such as the influence of educational level or backgrounds, type of sport, age, gender or the impact of different time span and their influence on motivation.”

Point 15: Line 166. The time span is nearly a decade (from September 1, 2012 to January 8, 2021); may I inquire about the impact of such a long-time span on the results?

Response 15: We thank the reviewer for his/her comment. The MenPas platform recorded this data throughout this time through its users and we have not analyzed its influence, as this was not the main objective of the study. Again, we believe that this is an interesting suggestion, and we believe it is appropriate to add it to the paragraph on future research mentioned above.

Point 16: Line 177. Maybe "studied" should be removed.

Response 17: The word has been removed.

Point 18: Line 178. Please provide information about the AMOS 23.0 software. Although almost everyone is aware of it, we should all adhere to these basic guidelines.

Response 18: The following paragraph was included in Statistical Analysis: "AMOS 23 (IBM, Armonk, NY, USA) and IBM SPSS Statistics, Version 23 (IBM, Armonk, NY, USA) were used for data analysis."

Conclusion section

Point 19: Line 335. It's possible that the authors' claim that it's "even better than previous paper studies" is uncritical. Qualitative comparisons can be less or more rigorous.

Response 19: The text has been changed: "even with higher reliability indices than previous paper studies".

Point 20: Line 341. If COVID-19 must be mentioned, I recommend that the authors include it in the introduction. This will help to provide critical support for the development and validation of digital scale.

Response 20: We thank the reviewer for his/her comment. A paragraph in introduction was rewritten: "The recent adversities experienced by COVID-19 affect in daily lives and different habits such as physical activity and sport adherence [7] and makes it difficult for many people to gather in one place. Online tools could solve this and provide many advantages in different ways: they reduce data collection time, offer immediate results, facilitate the questionnaires filling, are cheaper and more sustainable [8, 9], thus highlighting the need for progress in digital data collection techniques [10, 11, 12]."