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Author’s response to reviews:

Revisions

Manuscript number: SSMR-D-16-00056R3

Reviewer #3

Reviewer’s comment:

General comments to the authors

I regret that the authors have not applied all the corrections I have asked and they have not replied adequately on the points I have raised in the previous revision. There are two main points to consider. First, the order effect of testing the dependent variables should be presented. The low coefficient of variation does not guarantee the absence of any order effect and the authors need to present numbers confirming no order effect.

Authors’ response:

The authors thank you for your comment and apologise, we have now assessed between week differences of repeated sprint ability and relative average and best power at 1 hour post to see if there was an order of effect. The results are in the results section (lines 182-189, page 9-10). The statistical analyses section has also been updated to include this analysis (page 9, lines 170-171).

Reviewer’s comment:
Second, numerical values of heart rate and load should be presented for the fatiguing part of the experiment. Just mentioning it in lines 210-202 does not confirm something. You need to present at least the heart rate values during this part of the experiment.

Authors’ response:

Averages and standard deviations have now been provided in the results section (lines 193-197, page 10) for RPE and average HR values; to further show the high reproducibility and comparability of the test conditions, load and participant effort.