Reviewer #1

General comments:
This manuscript examined psychometric properties of the PLAYself instrument in a sample of secondary school student-athletes. Overall, this manuscript was well written which made it enjoyable and easy to read. With minimal revisions, I believe this manuscript is suitable for publication.

> Authors' Response: Thank you to the reviewer for making constructive recommendations to improve the overall quality of the manuscript. We have implemented all suggestions using Track Changes.

Specific comments:
Introduction:
The introduction is well-written. It provides a nice overview of the topic of physical literacy/other background information, and it clearly identifies the gap in current literature.

Line 51-52: The researchers justify this population by highlighting the lack of literature. Maybe include an additional sentence about the importance for obtaining this information for secondary student-athletes specifically.

> Authors' Response: The following sentence was added "Due to the lack of empirical evidence for adolescent student-athletes, it's critical to better understand current levels of physical literacy to positively impact future health outcomes" to show the importance of work in this population.

Methods:
I think the methods are very well written. The researchers did a nice job of writing in a concise manner yet providing enough details about how the student was performed. I believe I could reproduce this study with the information provided which cannot be said about many manuscripts these days!

> Authors' Response: Wow! What a compliment regarding the ability to replicate. Our team strongly believes in transparency and writing a story that another researcher could reproduce. Thank you!

Line 77-78: Can the authors clarify why they used 'completed grade' instead of the current grade of the student-athlete.

> Authors' Response: In PE curriculum the motor development benchmarks are listed per grade (Shape America guidelines), so we felt it was reasonable to ask what grade the participants have completed because then we could assume that they should be

accountable for the expected outcomes of that grade. Compared to if they're in 9th grade but maybe have not taken PE yet or have not gotten to a particular unit.

Lines 96-99: For readers not familiar with the PLAYself, it may be helpful to mention that the fitness item was not included because that's how the original questionnaire is designed (as opposed to the researchers omitting it for various reseasons).

Authors' Response: This is an excellent recommendation! We have added the following to the end of the sentence, "…which aligns with the previously validated scoring procedure."

Line 97: I do not think the ")" needs to be there.

Authors' Response: Thank you for catching this. The ")" has been removed.

Results:
Do the researchers have any information on the specific sports student-athletes were involved in? It may not be relevant but could be interesting to note. Additionally, did the researchers explore any differences in physical literacy by grade level (again, may not be relevant to the current study, but may be interesting to explore in the future). Otherwise, the results are nicely presented. The tables make it especially easy to visualize the data.

Author's Response: We added information to Table 1 and a line in the Results section showing the types of sports that the participants competed in. We decided not to analyze the physical literacy outcomes by grade level to remain focused on the validity estimation purpose.

Discussion:
Again, the discussion is well written. The researchers do a great job comparing/contrasting their results with similar studies. However, I encourage the researchers to explore their results a little more in depth. For example, they state that "this is a very confident cohort". Why do they think this is?; what role might athletics play in this?; do they think these results would be the same in another group of US secondary student-athletes?; etc.

Authors' Response: Thank you. We appreciate this feedback. In terms of our finding, the PLAYself parameter was "my fitness is good enough to let me do all of the activities I choose," which is actually not reported in comparable studies in different populations. Due to that reason, we didn't want to speculate too far out of what we measured but have added this as an area of future research that should be reported and explored.