

## Comments for 94208

NO	SECTION	LINE	COMMENTS
1	ABSTRACT	24-29	Background should explain what the problem is and explain why saliva was chosen.mments
2	INTRODUCTION	47-85	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In the Introduction of this manuscript, we cannot find out what the problem of this study is. It should be explained in the introduction, at present what techniques are the gold standard for analyzing athletic performance in soccer, and what are the shortcomings of these techniques so that saliva is the best alternative to overcome the shortcomings of previous techniques.</li> <li>2. The author should explain why this review is discussing soccer, not other sports.</li> </ol>
3	DISCUSSION	161-	<p>1. In manuscript the authors wrote: <i>The most studied salivary biomarkers were 162 cortisol (n=59), testosterone (n=42), salivary IgA (n=45, 23%), Creatine MiRNAs (n=4), salivary 163 alpha-amylase (n=8), and genetic polymorphisms (n=5).</i></p> <p>But we could not find discussion/analysis about testosterone and genetic polymorphisms in Discussion section.</p> <p>2. The aim of this study was:</p> <p><i>Therefore, here we aimed to map the literature on using saliva as a diagnostic tool in soccer, analyzing which salivary biomarkers are employed and describing the available protocols.</i></p> <p>In this manuscript, the authors did not mention the saliva analysis method, one of important point for protocols</p> <p>3. The authors should discuss which is the best saliva collection method between stimulated, unstimulated, and the use of specific salivary collectors such as salivette and swabs for soccer players</p>

