We appreciated all of the comments. I have uploaded all of the comments so each reviewer is confident in our revised manuscript efforts.

Thank you,

Marc Lochbaum

Reviewer 1

Please include in introduction another or recent studies in this topic.

We included a very recent meta-analysis as opposed to a single study.


Please add and others parameters to table 1 because looks too simple and point after the title of tables 1,2 and 3.

We deleted Table 1. The information concerning the timing of the scales is found in the manuscript.

The references are not in line to the policy of the journal (see abbreviations of journals).

We worked hard on making the changes.

Reviewer 2

I would like to congratulate the authors on the presentation of a well written and highly interesting manuscript. The manuscript provides a detailed analysis of the motivational climates experienced by youth athletes and reports some key significant differences for those making elite levels of performance.

Thank you.

Broad Comments -

The introduction is nicely constructed and provides detailed background information on the topic and the theoretical framework. The methods are clearly explained and logical. This was a comprehensive study, which I again applaud the authors for. The results are well presented and clear. Logical conclusions are made throughout the discussions. The findings can be easily applied to a number of sports and (I would imagine) are relevant to most other countries with similar sport/athlete development systems.

The suggestion of incorporating task climate coaching within the club system is important, if anything the authors could provide some practical suggestions as to how this could be achieved.

Addressed in the conclusions.

Specific Comments -
I feel the article title could be altered to provide a better understanding of the study. For me "Individual and Climate Perceptions" is awkward and would be better with a clear link to motivation / motivational climates.

Thank you for your suggestion. The titled was changed.

Line 12 - Abstract "Despite the high rates of sports club participation among Finnish youth" is awkwardly worded. Could be revised to "Despite the high rates of participation in sports clubs among Finnish youth".

Corrected.

Line 33 - insert "of" before becoming elite athletes.

Corrected.

2.2 Measures - can validity and reliability scores of the questionnaires be included in this section.

Completely redone.

Line 252 - "participant" needs to be revised to "participate"

Corrected.

Reviewer 3

Thank you for your time. You will see in red all of our changes. We addressed all of your comments in full.

Page 1 – Title – should it state something about which climate – motivational climate?

Abstract:

Page 1 – line 13: Perceived motivational climate? The authors seem to use different terms? Please use the same.

Page 1 – line 13: sport enjoyment instead of enjoyment? See the rest of the text

Page 1 – line 17: motivational variables: please specify

Page 1 – line 21: significantly higher differences?

Page 1 – line 28: sport enjoyment

Introduction

All changed.

Page 2 – line 49: please specify approximately number of athletes?

Page 2 – line 65: coaches’ support boost autonomous.. could this be rephrased
Page 2 – line 91-93: please rephrase would self-reported higher...

Page 2 – line 95: Types; task ..

Materials and Methods

Page 3 – line 100: you could use T1 instead of Time 1. Etc.

Changed.

Page 3 – line 104: is the somewhat skewness in terms of the overrepresentations in soccer discussed in the article? Should it? Potential explanation/bias on some of the results?

We do not know of a logical reason soccer, basketball, and ice hockey players would or could differ.


The overriding theme is elite status attainment. It certainly could be that females responded at a higher rate (they did). Whether this impacted the data, we do not know given the volunteer nature of the study. I (Marc Lochbaum) do not see the study reported differences out of line with meta-analyses and systematic reviews in and around all of our topics. If we reported effect size difference values greater than 1.0 or many even above .80, then I would have been surprised.

If we examined CSAI-2 variables, then we would have been worried in the opposite direction (elite lower than European Club athletes) as shown in Lynette Craft’s meta-analysis concerning the CSAI-2 many years ago.

![Image of tables and graphs]

**Type of Athlete:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Athlete</th>
<th>Elite Athletes</th>
<th>European Club</th>
<th>College Athletes</th>
<th>College P.E. Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cog</td>
<td>S-C</td>
<td>Som</td>
<td>Cog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td></td>
<td>-16*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(CI = .63, .21)</td>
<td>(CI = .27, .06)</td>
<td>(CI = .59, .01)</td>
<td>(CI = .44, .04)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Time of Administration of the CSAI-2:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Administration</th>
<th>Elite Athletes</th>
<th>European Club</th>
<th>College Athletes</th>
<th>College P.E. Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 min. or less prior</td>
<td>Cog</td>
<td>S-C</td>
<td>Som</td>
<td>Cog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td></td>
<td>-11*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(CI = .14, .08)</td>
<td>(CI = .22, .01)</td>
<td>(CI = .09, .31)</td>
<td>(CI = .12, .07)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 4 – line 146: is this measurement related to Physical Activity Enjoyment Scale (PAES)?
Page 4 – line 155: Why was MCPES used in stead of PMCSQ used in Time 1?? What is the logic? Physical Education?

The logic was reasonable. Examining perceptions of social relatedness support and autonomy support fit in line with the 2010 focus on SDT theory. Our reliability values all were > than .83. Reliability values do not make it 100% okay, however we are confident the scale held together with the minor change from PE context to the club sport context.

Page 4 – line 184: so the overall response rate was 8.43 %?

Addressed in limitations section.

Results

Page 5 – line 210: but you could have used the data from the sample compared to the elite?

We did.

Page 6 – line 225: Time 1 and Time 2 data? Both are included in this section?

Whatever the misunderstanding, it seems addressed.

Page 6 – line 237: perceived confidence, which measurement is that based on?

This was an error in typing. There is no measure of perceived competence.

Page 6 – line 239; the table, there are some numbers in bold letters, what are they? The significant ones are marked with a *?

*removed.

Page 7 – line 249: the Hedges’g values could have been listed in the table?

Removed from text, included in table.

Page 7 – line 261-3: see the point, but what is the relevance for the article?

Removed.