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The aim of the study was to develop a psychometrically valid and reliable tool to assess general and sport nutrition knowledge in track and field athletes. The main findings were that after some adjustments the questionnaire could be completed within a reasonable time, had good internal validity and good reliability. Furthermore, the questionnaire distinguished nutritional trained participants from non-trained.

The study seems to be well conducted with a systematic development and testing of the questionnaire. Overall the questionnaire seems to be well-structured and thoroughly reviewed by experts, but because of the large heterogeneity between athletes in different sports, also within track and field, there are still some questions that could be discussed with reference to a correct answer and relevance.

Specific points:

Introduction

Table 1 is not necessary and can be removed; only the reference should be given (Klein, P. 2007)

Discussion

As mentioned in the general comments it is challenging to optimize a questionnaire to heterogenic groups of athletes. For track and field athletes, there are large differences in the sport specific nutritional needs between middle and longs distance runners compared to the strength and power athletes and sprinters. Consequently, some guidelines given for the runners are not important for the other groups and vice versa. In some of the questions, this is specified, but in other questions (e.g. Q 55). Although this challenge has been met in many cases there are still some challenges that should be discussed in the paper.
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