

**Reviewer Recommendation and Comments for Manuscript Number RJSP-2018-1855****Self-Controlled Amount and Pacing of Practice Facilitate Learning of a Sequential Timing Task**Original Submission  
Andreas Bund **Reviewer 1**[Back](#) [Edit Review](#) [Print](#) [Submit Review to Editorial Office](#)**Recommendation: Minor Revision****Custom Review Question(s)**

Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript?

**Response**

Yes

Article Assessment Impact of article

Top 30%

Article Assessment Originality of article

Top 50%

Article Assessment Quality of data and methods

Top 30%

Do you want to get recognition for this review on [Publons](#)?

Yes

*Don't let your reviewing work go unnoticed! Researchers the world over use Publons to effortlessly track their valuable peer review contributions for any journal. If you opt in, your Publons profile will automatically be updated to show a verified record of this review in full compliance with the journal's review policy. If you don't have a Publons profile, you will be prompted to create a free account. [Learn more]*

**Reviewer Blind Comments to Author:****Abstract and Introduction**

- \* Triple citation of Post et al-studies in the first lines of the abstract is redundant, especially in case of self-referentiality. Another studie(s) can be cited to verify the statement of the first sentence.
- \* Line 14 of abstract: More properly "Self-control groups..."
- \* Line 14/15 of abstract: The acronyms "ACE" and "VE" have not yet been explained.
- \* Last sentence of the abstract: Evidence for this statement is very weak! This statement should be formulated in a "softer" way...
- \* The IMI results should be included into the abstract with just a few words.
- \* Introduction is clear and well-structured written and provides a good overview over the current research. However, references of the last 5 years are rather dominated by studies from Post et al; the authors should add more recent studies from other authors.
- \* As the IMI hypothesis, the self-control hypothesis should be completed in terms of comparison ("superior to the yoked group learners").

**Method**

- \* The final sample size of N = 56 is quite small. A power analysis should have been carried out to determine the optimal sample size!
- \* More information on sampling and participants should be provided (e.g., reward, background)
- \* How was the IMI adapted? Does the validity/consistency data of the adapted version comes from a pilot study or the present experiment (p. 8)?
- \* How was the pacing of amount determined for the YKP group ? Automatically by the software or manually by the test leader (p. 11)?

**Results**

- \* Considering the fact that 2 of 3 participants with the lowest mean ACE scores only has performed the minimum of three aquisition blocks, I'm wondering about the statement that "There was not a relationship between amount of blocks completed and overall performance..." (p. 14).
- \* The relationship between inter-trial pacing time and performance scores should be checked too (p. 15)!
- \* Why figures AND tables with (almost) identical data?

**Discussion**

- \* From my point of view, the results are mainly discussed with reference to previous studies and too little in terms of theoretical and methodological aspects.
- \* The results should be further discussed against the background of some methodological limitations of the present experiment (e.g., small sample size, laboratory task without meaning and context for the participants [!], SCP group learners had control over two different aspects, namely time of preparation and time for visual feedback).

**Reviewer Confidential Comments to Editor:**

The present paper examines the separate effects of self-controlled amount- and pacing of practice on learning a timing task. In general, self-controlled learning continues to be an important topic in the field of motor learning and the specific issue of this study promises new and interesting findings. Overall, the introduction is clear and well-structured written and provides a good (but understandably not complete) overview over the current research. However, references of the last 5 years are rather dominated by studies from Post et al; the authors should add more recent studies from other authors. With regard to the "underlying mechanism for self-control effects" (p. 3), I'd like to refer auf the antagonistic explanation model of self-controlled learning from Bund and Wiemeyer (2005).

The method is described in line with common standards, however, some information on sampling, participants, and the IMI questionnaire should be added.

With regard to the results section, I would recommend a reduction of the number of figures and tables or the restriction to figures OR tables.

The discussion of the findings is focused on previous studies and has to be expanded in terms of theoretical and methodological (e.g., sample size, experimental task) aspects.

**Reference**

Bund, A. & Wiemeyer, J. (2005). Self-controlled practice of motor skills: Current status of research and an antagonistic explanation model. *Spectrum der Sportwissenschaften* 17 (2), 8-25. [German]

[Back](#)[Edit Review](#)[Print](#)[Submit Review to Editorial Office](#)