Manuscript Title: Differences in FMS Scores among Distance Runners and Sprinters

Reviewer's Comments: Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? (Few sentences)
Yes, this manuscript holds relevance for the scientific community, particularly in the fields of sports science, kinesiology, athletic training, and injury prevention—though its importance is specific and limited in scope

Strengths:

1. **Clear Research Objective:**
   - The presentation is clear and addresses exercise economy, movement patterns, and the application of FMS in runners.
   - It clearly identifies the research gap and states the research objective..
2. **Methodological Rigor:**
   - Provide a detailed description of the study design (quantitative), variables, sample source, and inclusion criteria.
   - Use standard tools (FMS) and appropriate statistical methods (Mann-Whitney U test).
   - Consideration of inter- and intra-rater reliability demonstrates rigorous experimental control.
3. **Clinical Relevance:**
   - Yes, this study has clinical relevance, especially in functional movement screening and corrective training planning.
4. **Comprehensive Literature Review:**
   - The literature is well-cited and includes recent publications (e.g., Waite, 2024).
5. **Well-Organized Structure:**
   - The article only requires minor formatting improvements to enhance readability and professionalism. For example, the research question and hypothesis should be included at the end of the introduction, as their current separation feels slightly disjointed.

Area of improvement:

1. **Title:**
   - Academic papers rarely use abbreviations in their titles, as this can lead to confusion or misunderstanding. It is recommended to spell out the abbreviation in its full form for clarity.
2. **Abstract:**
   - A structured abstract (e.g., objective, methods, results, conclusions) is recommended to enhance clarity and reader comprehension.
   - The final sentence is somewhat conservative. Consider strengthening the conclusion by including practical implications, such as: "The findings may serve as a reference for coaches in designing training programs."

3. **Introduction:**
    - The introduction should end with a clearly stated research question and hypothesis. Currently, these are listed separately at the end, and would be more appropriately integrated into the concluding paragraph of the introduction.
    - The second and third paragraphs of the introduction, as well as the opening sentence of the "Research Design" section, all repeat a similar sentence: "This study aims to use the FMS as a tool to identify differences in movement patterns between collegiate long-distance runners and sprinters/jumpers to help prevent injury and improve performance." Simplifying and varying the wording is recommended to improve fluency.
    - To support this research aim, the introduction should first provide a brief review of literature comparing the movement characteristics and typical injury patterns of long-distance runners versus sprinters.
4. **Methodology Clarity:**
    - The first two paragraphs of the "Research Design" section are repetitive. Also, statistical analysis is already discussed later in the Methods and does not need to be introduced here.
    - The methodology should include a justification of the sample size, along with an explanation of why the number of participants was relatively small.
5. **Figures:** No figures are included.
6. **Tables and Study Data Integration:**
    - The table title could be more specific, such as: "Comparison of FMS Lower Limb Scores Between LD and SDJ Groups."
    - Since the FMS consists of seven assessment items but only four are presented, the remaining three should also be reported and analyzed for completeness. If only four were assessed due to specific reasons, this rationale should be clearly explained in the methodology.
    - Table 1 already presents the statistical values clearly, so repeating the same data in the second paragraph of the Results section is unnecessary.
7. **Discussion:**
    - The study's objective includes using FMS to explore both performance and injury risk. However, the discussion does not adequately address whether lower FMS scores among LD runners are associated with a higher risk of injury.
    - Since LD runners scored consistently lower, the discussion should also explore whether this reflects a limitation in the FMS's applicability to endurance-based sports. Is the tool better suited for evaluating power-based athletes? This point warrants discussion.
8. **Limitation:**
    - The relatively small sample size (N = 30) is a common limitation in applied research, but its impact on the generalizability of findings should be explicitly stated.
    - Gender differences were not analyzed in this study. It is recommended to either include a supplementary analysis or mention in the limitations whether this variable might affect FMS outcomes.
9. **Conclusion:**
    - The conclusion is somewhat lengthy and lacks focus, due to repetition of earlier results and inclusion of unsubstantiated inferences. It should be more concise and evidence-based.
    - The statement that "lower FMS scores may benefit LD runners" is a potentially significant claim and should be substantiated with stronger evidence or further discussed rather than appearing abruptly in the conclusion.
10. **References:**
    - The names "Mohka" and "Mokha" appear inconsistently. The correct spelling

should be verified against the original publications.

- When citing the same author multiple times (e.g., Cook et al., 2011 and 2013), even if referencing foundational material, combining or summarizing citations where appropriate is recommended to avoid redundancy.

Minor Suggestions:

1. Clarity & Conciseness

2. Minor Typographical & Formatting Issues

Recommendations for Publication:

Major Revision:

<u>Guideline:</u>

- Accept:
- Minor Revision:
- Major Revision:
- Serious Major revision:
- Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered):
- Strongly rejected (with irreparable deficiencies.):