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Dear Dr. Gracia-Marco, dear Ms. Dalumpines
We would like to thank you for sending us the editor’s comments of our manuscript entitled "Effect of living area and sports club participation on physical fitness in children: A 4 year longitudinal study". The comments of the editor helped us to focus our findings and improve the manuscript. Below you will find our point-by-point responses to the editor’s comments and their reflection in the manuscript in the online submission (editor’s comments: changes highlighted in grey).

If additional information is required please contact me directly.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. habil. Thomas Muehlbauer
Editor's comments: highlighted changes in grey

Comment 1: Comment 2 from reviewer 1 has not been fully replied. It is not fully clear what happened with those 106 participants.

Statement 1: We specified the information on that question and added a further sentence to the revised version of this manuscript. That is: “Sixty-six out of those 172 children either continuously participated (n=49) or did not participate (n=17) in a sports club at all. The remaining one-hundred six children changed their status of sports club participation from ‘Yes’ to ‘No’ or vice versa over the study period and were therefore not included in our analysis.”

Comment 2: Can you please include the sample size in your tables and figures? For example, add $n$ in table 2 for each grade. This will help to fully understand your tables/figures and see the distribution of your sample.

Statement 2: As you mentioned we included the sample size in our Tables and Figure captions.

Comment 3: Why not to show the interaction $p$ and ES in figures 1a, 2a, 2b, and 2d, 2e as significant results were found between groups? Or is this due to the fact that the interaction $p$ was higher than 0.05? In addition, I wonder whether it is relevant or not to include interaction $p$ and ES for figures 1f and 2f as they are not significant.

Statement 3: The editor is right. Interaction $p$-values and effect sizes were not shown in figures 1a, 2a, 2b, 2d, and 2e because there were no statistically significant differences between groups. With respect to Figure 1f and 2f, the interaction $p$-values and effect sizes indicate non-significant findings and were therefore deleted.
Comment 4: Final comment in relation to the figures, as the outcome for the 50m sprint and star coordination test is seconds, obviously the trend in the figure looks opposite to the other tests, as the lower the score, the better the performance. It would be helpful to include a note in the figure caption mentioning that for these tests, lower scores indicate better performance.

Statement 4: We included additional information in the notes for Figure 1 and 2 mentioning that: “for the 50-m sprint and the star coordination run, lower scores indicate better performance; for the 1-kg ball push, the triple hop, the stand-and-reach, and the 9-min run, higher scores indicate better performance”.