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Reviewer's report:

The author has revised the manuscript substantially. Although it is more simplified and straightforward, I am still facing some limitation that I think need to be take care of before the paper is ready for publication.

Major Compulsory Revisions

A small proportion of all the boys who were asked to participate in the study, completed it. This is a first reason to be more cautious in presenting the finding. The internal consistency of the ATTAIN is not high (.62). This is another reason to be cautious in interpreting and reporting of the result. Data from 41 out of 55 boys (75%) were used to measure test-retest reliability. ICC has been reported for items of the ATTAIN and a high variation is reported. ICC is performed on basis of different algorithms in different softwares. It might be right or completely wrong method for calculating test-retest reliability. The author has not reported what Software was used to run the analysis. Thus, I cannot provide an informed judgment. For some guidance, please see Weir, J.P. (2005). Quantifying test-retest reliability using the intraclass correlation coefficient and the SEM. J Strength Cond Res. 219(1), 231-40. Other important sources are: Shrout and Fleiss (1979), as well as McGraw and Wong, (1996). What software was used for data analysis? In addition, the content validity aspect was tested using a very limited group of experts and young adolescents.

Given the above, and despite all the limitations, I see this work as valuable and important, but until it is presented in terms of a pilot work, or an initial study, with more cautious formulations, I would advice against publication. If the author is willing to put the study in its context and be more clear about the outcomes as promising, but preliminary, I will be delighted to provide more support and suggestions to improve the details.
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