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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

No - there are minor issues

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

Not sure - key details are missing from the manuscript

Statistics - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

No - there are issues with the statistics in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable
OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: Study aims to explore factors of affective experiences which are related to use of activity trackers by introducing personality traits and socio-demographic variables their potential predictors. Research field seems to be relevent new, but growing, and proposed topic seems highly relevant, both from theoretical and applicable perspective. However, the first two research questions and reported results look trivial. Besides that, execution of research and presentation of results is a little bit sloppy.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

1. Authors should provide more details on reasons to contrast present and previous users on their experiences regarding wearables, or justify in some other way the inclusion on disproportionately small group on non-present users in research. Why measures of potential predictors were not collected for this subgroup?

2. Reliability coefficients for personality traits (item correlations) and affective responses (Cronbach's alphas) should be reported.

3. Preparatory data analyses (detection of outliers and normality tests) should be reported in more details.

4. Please, present results of each of four performed multiple regression analyses. Also, within each analysis, provide information on standardized regression coefficients (so-called β values). Sole relying on p-value omits information regarding both size and direction of effect.

5. Typos, such as omission of equals sign (page 10, line 7), need to be corrected.

6. All statistics (with the exception of some p values) should be rounded to two decimal places.

7. Letters that represent a statistical value (such as M, SD, t, F, and p) should be italicized.

8. Leading zero should not be used if given value could not be greater than 1.0 (e.g. page 10, line 42).

9. When reporting on p-values, use "p < .001" instead of "p = .001" (or even "p = < .001"?!) to indicde highly significant results.
10. Comma should be used when reporting on different statistics in sequence (see, e.g., page 10, line 22).

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

I have enlisted all my suggestions in 5f. section.

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

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.

No

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 am able to assess the statistics

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

Acceptable
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