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Reviewer's report:

Please see following text written in capitals which was not clearly addressed in the manuscript.

"Comment: The methods section contains large number of fundamental methodological flaws that make the paper weak. The interval of CK sample collection fails to determine peak CK in accordance with the body of evidence associated with the literature.

Response: Thank you for this comment; this is certainly of importance and WE HAVE HIGHLIGHTED THE RATIONALE FOR THE INTERVAL OF CK SAMPLING IN THE MANUSCRIPT. These time points correspond to when players would be returning to training post-match. Our choice to collect samples prior to training was based on similar methods employed by Cunniffe (2010; EJAP) – time course of changes in immunoendocrine markers following an international rugby game.

Comment: The authors need to outline in the study if all samples were taken AT THE SAME TIME OF DAY.

Response: Thank you for this comment. We have highlighted the interval sample points were based on the times when players were returning to training post-match. THIS INFORMATION IS NOW INCORPORATED INTO OUR MANUSCRIPT."

There are some rooms for improvement in English writing and format.

There are some examples I found when I quickly read through it (indicated in yellow marks in manuscript).

Please pay special attention to make the manuscript in concise and clear language.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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