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Reviewer's report:

This paper studies the perception of soccer player with regard to risk of injury depending on type of surface, natural grass and 3rd generation artificial turf. It finds that the majority of players indicate that they perceive a higher risk on artificial turf.

The paper is well written and easy to follow. The aims of the study are clearly laid out.

Major issues:

1. A main challenge with this study is how the finding shed new light on the issue if the type of surface affects injury risk and physical loading. In the introduction, a better foundation should be presented what the affects of the players’ (subjective) impression of risk is. This is particularly important as most research seems to show that no large risk differences exist between NG and FT.

2. Methodologically a strong bias is introduced by the selection of players. The vast majority has most training and playing experience on natural grass. Thus, it is not surprising that they prefer this type of surface. It would have been a great improvement if players who have most experience on artificial turf would have been included. This may be hard or impossible to do, but at least the authors should, on the current dataset, analyse the relationship between FT/NG experience and survey response. A start may be to consider team 1 who train on FT. Furthermore, this bias in the selection of participants and the consequence for interpretation should be discussed in detail. Note that the bias I mention here is another one than the bias discussed (bottom 1st page of discussion) in your paper.

Minor:

Given recent research on different types of 3rd generation turf (e.g., McGhie and Ettema) it may be a good idea to specify in more detail the turf specifications of the turf that is used most frequently.
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Quality of written English: Acceptable
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