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Reviewer's report:

General comments:

Well done to the authors for the update and the work done on the presentation of results, which is now much clearer whilst still in the long way.

Overall the manuscript has been well updated and clarified. However, I would recommend that the Authors double check again a couple of details such as: numbering of paragraphs, some words are written two times in a row, results in tables are presented in a random order. All these details are of first importance for the understanding of the manuscript. That should be crystal clear for the reader. Please refer to the specific comments and suggestions below to make improvements.

Specific comments:

- Table 1: class the studies by alphabetical order or sports rather than randomly. A landscape format would be also appropriate.

- Table 5: legend: take off "Induced" written 2 times.

- Table 9: This one is not 100% necessary and relevant since protocol very greatly between studies and sports and thus are not really comparable.

- Check the numbering throughout the whole document. For instance, it is indicated:

  "3. Results, then 4.3a study selection"

  "5. Discussion, then 4.a systematic research"

- In the results section, please reformulate the subtitles "3.b.4 Analyses" and "3.c. Hormone findings" It is too weak and not precise. Define your sections more accurately.
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