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Reviewer’s report:

The paper titled „The influence of a Healthy Welcoming Environment on participation in club sport by adolescent girls: a longitudinal study“ investigated the perceived influence of sports club health promotion practices on participation in sports clubs among adolescent girls, and how these perceptions changed longitudinally. Although the paper has some strengths such as the originality and the use a longitudinal design, there are some critical problems that I believe could not be overcome in a revision of this manuscript. Therefore, I think that the paper should be rejected. Below I point some comments in case authors would like to consider.

P 5. Method section. Although authors report that more deep methodological details are reported previously in the study number 25, I believe that they should describe the methods sections with more details in this paper. I also concern about the validity of the used instruments.

P 5. Lines 7-12. Authors should report how the participating school were selected (e.g., if they were randomly selected).

P 5. Lines 27-36. Authors should provide more information regarding the used measure instruments: the specific used instruments, the validity of them, etc.

P 5. Lines 27-36. PA levels assessed by self-reported questionnaires are not very valid instruments, especially in 7-year-old children; to my knowledge self-reported height and weight is neither valid at this age. Please provide previous studies that support the validity of these instruments among children. Otherwise, this should be clearly acknowledged.

P 5. Lines 56-58. No influence, negative influence and don´t know options were categorized as "other". I think that "don’t know" should be treat as miss data instead of "other" (children reported that they "don’t know" if it was positive, neutral or negative). Additionally, from a theoretical point of view, I think that "no influence" (i.e. "neutral", no negative nor positive) should not be joined with "negative influence". Maybe it should be named "non-positive influence".

P 6. Lines 1-3. Authors reported that baseline characteristics of the "completers" and "non-completers" participants were compared using t-tests. Did these baseline variables meet the t-tests assumptions like the normality? Otherwise, a non-parametric test should be used instead.
P 6. Line 26-33. Although I am not an expert in the main statistical test used, I think that a statistical significant interaction should be followed by a post hoc analysis and not separating the sample in two analyses.

P 6. Line 59- P7 Line 1. According to the results, completers and non-completers participants different in some important variables related with sport participation such as weight, PE participation, competitive team sports outside school and competitive individual sports at school. I think that the analyzed sample in the present study is biased and, therefore, results should be taken with caution.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable

**Declaration of competing interests**
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal