

<b>Areas</b>	<b>Comments/Remarks</b>
<b>Specific suggestions to improve quality of the manuscript</b>	<i>Introduction needs detail exploring of selected variables. I suggest that you improve the description at lines 57-65 to provide more detail information about variables.</i>
<b>Constructive criticism</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. Complete raw data is provide in manuscript which is food practice. But in table no 1, Badminton training experience for each national level player is given whereas none of International player had badminton training experience. It seems something is missing please recheck it.</i></li> <li><i>2. Line no 102 “terminal box of an analogue/digital converter. The 12 infrared cameras were positioned in the” be specific where its, was “analogue or converter” used in your study.</i></li> </ol>
<b>Strengths of the manuscript</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. Authors had taken care of all mandatory requirements of good experimental research work by taking ethical approval and also having written consent form participants.</i></li> <li><i>2. Discussion made by authors in this manuscript was very well supported by studies related to findings.</i></li> <li><i>3. Complete raw data is provide in manuscript.</i></li> <li><i>4. Good manuscript writing is done in English.</i></li> </ol>
<b>Statistical weakness of the manuscript</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. Manuscript is missing Shapiro-Wilk (SW) test which is mentioned in line no 157.</i></li> <li><i>2. Manuscript is missing Mann-Whitney U test which is mentioned in line no 158.)</i></li> <li><i>3. Chi-square test. (Analysis missing which is mentioned in line no 160.)</i></li> </ol>