

Review

The article presents an exciting logic in which the chosen motor task fits well. The results are promising, although not statistically significant. However, there are important issues that the authors should consider for the article's publication.

Major Issues

1. The authors conflate variability in the goal of the task/skill between attempts with intrinsic variability of the motor response. Schmidt's proposed logic relates to the variability in the goal of the task. This means manipulating the goal between attempts increases mnemonic processes that positively impact learning. In this logic, the motor output, or intrinsic variability, is not a "marker" of induced variability. This can be easily verified by examining the explanations of the two main approaches: Schema Theory and Contextual Interference Effect. Neither of them provides explanations using intrinsic variability as a dependent variable. Subsequently, in the 1990s (e.g., Lai & Shea, 1998), something about the stability of the motor response (similar to intrinsic variability) emerged, but to indicate learning of the relative dimension of the skill or generalized motor program. On the other hand, intrinsic variability follows an approach with little relation to Schmidt's proposed cognitive logic. In fact, it assumes a non-representational approach for its explanations or dynamics approach. There must be a relationship between these two distinct forms, as varying the goal should increase intrinsic variability. The authors should better formulate the introduction.
2. This difference between the different variabilities becomes evident in the data analysis. How can the authors ensure that the high variability group was the one that showed high intrinsic variability of the motor response over attempts during acquisition? It is only possible to ensure the existence of high variability in the goal of the task/skill between attempts because the authors did not measure the variability during the acquisition.
3. The novelty of the work is in manipulating (although the authors indicate quantifying) different levels of variability. However, this is not novel; there are several studies with different levels of variability (e.g., 10.26582/k.48.2.5).

Minor Issues

1. Why is autocorrelation an initially intrinsic variability measured?
2. What is the need for the control group?
3. "The Schema Theory suggests that this type of practice provides a flexible schema that allows an appropriate adaptation to a continuously changing environment (Schmidt, 1975)." Schmidt does not suggest "adaptation," but transfer. Look for "adaptation" in the original text; it will not be found. Adaptation and transfer are not synonymous.
4. What does the absolute error in the vertical and horizontal add to the study? Wouldn't the Mean Radial Error already represent both?
5. Present a graph indicating the radial error value throughout the phases between the groups.

