

Reviewer-1

The article is well-written and appropriately cited. It seems to address important findings adding to the literature focused around perceived self-efficacy. I believe it could add benefit to the scientific community overall. I'm uncertain of the appropriateness of the article to the aims and scope of this particular journal. Does it fit the scope? Does it aid Public/Population Health? Perhaps it's more suited for Exercise Science, Sports Psychology? Why this journal? Something to consider.

The references and in-text citations are proper. Some are older, but those appear to be classic and important to support the context of the article.

I was pleasantly surprised that the article is very well-written, and appears to be well-referenced. Exercise science and Sports Psychology (Bandura etc.) are not my expertise area, so I can't determine very well if this is novel research and whether or not it adds anything new to the field. My only concern, and this is more of an Editor question, is whether or not it fits the scope of this journal. Why not some other journal more focused around this particular topic?

Response: The article stresses the importance of community events as potential public health tools, given their public administration (i.e., through city resources), large scope, and community-oriented nature. We are hoping to demonstrate that such events have the potential to be public health tools that have enhance health behaviors through appropriate program design. I added some language to reinforce this public health context in the abstract, introduction, and conclusions to reinforce this point (highlighted). Outcomes related to athletic performance or exercise science aren't addressed in this article... the main point is that these types of events have the potential to enhance public health through identification with the event.

Reviewer-2

Identity theory and self-efficacy theory provide frameworks for understanding health behaviour, suggesting that athletic identity and perceived physical ability influence exercise participation.

The authors should add a subgroup analysis with individuals having both pre-test and post-test.

Response: Agreed, the current study did not include a between-subjects condition in which subjects' pre- and post-tests were matched. While differences in outcome variables were noted in independent samples pre-test/post-tests, they were not assessed at the individual level. We noted this as an important consideration for future research.