

General comments

Since the authors have selected an interesting research topic, their work should be acknowledged. However, its novelty is a little bit compromised. Looking for the main databases, there are some review papers that already worked closely on this thematic.

In general, the manuscript is well written. However, authors should reinforce the importance of this systematic review. The meaning is not clear. The authors should enhance the question that authors want to answer with this study. I expect that the specific comments can the manuscript.

Specific comments

Abstract – Include a sentence with the perspectives about the future studies conducting jumping landing tests.

Introduction

L88-89 – Describe those biomechanical variables from kinematics and kinetics areas.

L110-111 – The last sentence is redundant.

L122-129 – What its the meaning of this review? What authors wants to answer? The argument that “we have not found any reviews...” is not a justification to conduct a systematic review. The authors should insert the importance of this systematic review of a practical application, based on studies already published regarding DT/jumping tests and biomechanical variables.

What is the meaning of this research? What authors wants to answer? What´s the relevance of this study? This should be clear at the end of this section.

Material and Methods

Methodological quality

L-196-199 – Quote a pair of references in sport sciences systematic review that used NHLBI quality assessment.

Results

Table 3 – Information about the training volume should be included in this table.

Table 4 – Details about number of repetitions, intervals, should be included in each Jumping-Landing Test.

Table 5 – Details about the assessment instruments should be included. What kind of 3D camera system? Optoelectronic or digital cameras? 3D or 2D force plate? In what kind of

frequency both systems operated? Details about the variables should be included, for example COM velocity? x, y or z plane? All kinetic variables were normalized by body weight?

L36-137 – What biomechanical variables? Authors should better describe this point.

Discussion

L351-353- Very superficial this argument. Please, analyse all contexts involved in this review.

L363-382 – Why authors are discussing the methodological errors, once they were not presented in the results section?

The authors should include a para discussing about the kinetic, kinematic and eletromyography methods applied in each one of the studies.

L423-425- What is the novelty of this review?

L351-353- Very superficial this argument. Please, analyse all contexts involved in this review.

L363-382 – Why authors are discussing the methodological errors, once they were not presented on the results section?

The authors should include a para discussing about the kinetic, kinematic and eletromyography methods applied in each one of the studies.

L423-425- What is the novelty of this review?