Response – Review 2

Review 2	
Review Report	**Review Report (Round 1)**
Title clarity: Consider simplifying the title to make it more accessible, e.g., “Kinetic Variables as Predictors of Lower Limb Injuries in Team Sports: A Systematic Review.”	We appreciate the intention to enhance accessibility; however, we would like to clarify that the scope of our review is specifically focused on professional football (soccer). This population presents unique physical, tactical, and injury risk characteristics that distinguish it from other team sports. Therefore, we believe it is essential to explicitly mention "professional soccer" in the title to accurately reflect the study’s focus and ensure its relevance for practitioners, researchers, and medical staff working within this specific context.
Abstract clarity: The abstract lacks specific information about the main findings. Add 1–2 sentences summarizing the key conclusions (e.g., which kinetic variables were most relevant).	It is corrected
Keywords: Add keywords after the abstract to enhance searchability (e.g., “biomechanics,” “injury prevention,” “ground reaction force,” etc.).	Corrected
Introduction Provides a relevant and timely topic. Shows awareness of injury epidemiology and screening limitations. Revisions: Problem statement: Clarify the gap this review addresses—e.g., “Although kinetic variables are used in performance contexts, their utility in injury prediction remains unclear.”	Corrected
Introduction Hypothesis or aim: Be more explicit. Consider a final paragraph that ends with: “This review aimed to systematically examine the role of kinetic variables in predicting non-contact lower limb injuries in team sports.”	Corrected
Methods Search strategy: Include the search strings used in databases (PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science).	The equation for scopus and web of sicencie were already included in the paper. The equation for Pubmed was explicitly added, since the use of Mesh was alluded to, but the location of the terms was not specified. We appreciate the observation.
Methods Inclusion/exclusion criteria: Consider presenting them in a table for readability.	Suggestion accepted.
Methods Quality assessment: The modified Downs and Black checklist is appropriate, but state how	It was specified those authors who carried out the evaluation process independently, and in case of discrepancies, a third reviewer was consulted.

many reviewers did the scoring and how discrepancies were resolved.	
Methods PRISMA diagram: Include a complete one in the appendix if not already submitted.	It is included
Results Summary of studies: Include a comprehensive Table 1 summarizing each study: author/year, sample size, sport, kinetic variable(s), injury definition, follow-up period, primary outcomes.	We would like to clarify that all studies included in this review were conducted exclusively in the context of professional soccer, which is the defined scope of our systematic review. Therefore, specifying the sport in Table 1 would be redundant. As for the remaining items you mentioned—sample size, kinetic variables, injury definition, follow-up period, and main outcomes—they are already included in Table 1. Additionally, we have incorporated the definition of injury in accordance with your recommendation.
Results Findings structure: Break down into sub-sections (e.g., "Vertical Ground Reaction Force," "Lateral Imbalance," "Propulsion Forces") to guide the reader more effectively.	Subsections "3.4.1. Strength assessment using isokinetic dynamometer" and "3.4.2. Strength assessment using the Nordic hamstring curl test" were developed to complete the findings.
Results Statistical trends: Where possible, report effect sizes, p-values, or trends even if insignificant, to show patterns across studies.	As requested, we have reported effect sizes, odds ratios (ORs), relative risks (RRs), and p-values in Tables 3 and 4 for both univariate and multivariate analyses. Furthermore, the Results section now describes the main variables—such as concentric/eccentric torque, asymmetries, and H:Q ratios—along with the testing protocols and angular velocities used in the studies. However, we acknowledge that including all non-significant results was not feasible due to the high number and variability of kinetic parameters analyzed across the studies. Incorporating this information in tabular form would result in an excessively large and potentially redundant presentation, which may compromise the clarity and readability of the manuscript. Therefore, we prioritized the most relevant and consistent findings across studies, as part of our narrative synthesis. Nonetheless, we recognize the importance of identifying trends and have highlighted repeated patterns in the discussion to support future hypothesis-driven research.
Discussion Clarity: Clarify whether any variable showed strong evidence across multiple studies (e.g., was high vertical force at landing consistently linked to injury?).	Is added in practical applications section (4.6) No further changes were necessary in this section, as the manuscript already meets the recommendation.

Discussion Practical applications: Be more specific—what should coaches/trainers do differently based on these findings?	Is added
Discussion Limitations: Add more detail—e.g., high heterogeneity in study design, injury definitions, and follow-up durations.	The limitations of the systematic review were added to the limitations section, as well as the limitations resulting from the quality of the primary studies.
Discussion Future directions: Suggest specific future study designs (e.g., prospective cohort studies with standardized force plate protocols).	Future directions were developed based on study design, the need for multivariate analysis, need for research in female population, speed ecology of isokinetic dynamometry assessment and use of multi-joint testing.
Conclusion Be more assertive about the main takeaway.	Corrected
Conclusion Avoid vague phrasing like "there is an important need to investigate further…"—say what specifically should be investigated.	Corrected
Style and Language Review grammar and flow—some sentences are long or awkwardly structured.	Corrected
Style and Language Define abbreviations (e.g., "GRF" should be defined on first use).	Corrected
Style and Language Please ensure consistency in tense: use the past tense when describing previous studies.	Corrected
Figures and Tables Add a summary table of kinetic variables and their relationship with injury (e.g., ↑ GRF = ↑ injury risk in 4/6 studies).	Thank you for the suggestion. We opted not to include a summary table using simplified directional indicators (e.g., ↑ GRF = ↑ injury risk) due to the methodological heterogeneity among studies—such as differences in testing protocols, angular velocities, and asymmetry definitions—which limits the feasibility of a standardized quantitative summary. However, the relationship between kinetic variables and injury risk is thoroughly detailed in Tables 3 and 4, including which studies reported significant associations and their corresponding statistical values (OR, RR, p). This approach was chosen to ensure accuracy and alignment with the original data.
Figures and Tables Could you include illustrative figures where appropriate (e.g., a flowchart of kinetic screening vs injury monitoring)?	We agree on the value of visual support and have already included a flow chart (Figure 1) describing the study selection process. However, due to the heterogeneity of protocols, variables assessed, and outcome definitions in the included studies, it was not

	possible to develop a universal flow chart of kinetic screening versus lesion monitoring without risking oversimplification. Instead, we opted to provide detailed tabular summaries (Tables 3 and 4) reflecting the specific methods and variables used in each study, ensuring clarity and scientific accuracy.
References Ensure references are up-to-date and include recent studies from 2022–2024 if available.	Corrected
References Use a consistent citation style (APA, Vancouver, etc.) and double-check for formatting errors	Corrected