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Title: NUTRITIONAL KNOWLEDGE OF YOUTH ACADEMY ATHLETES

Dear Editor-in-Chief,

Please find attached revised manuscript and reviewer responses below outlining corrections and justification for the revised manuscript. We thank the reviewers for their insightful comments and have addressed all concerns of the peer reviewers and corrected for editorial office requirements.

REVIEWER REPORTS:

REVIEWER 1: Thank you for taking the time to review your manuscript and to reply to the reviewers comments, the manuscript is largely improved. In your comments to the reviewers you state that Pearson Correlation Coefficients were used to assess the relationships between the knowledge score and age, and years of study- however this information is still missing from the manuscript. I suggest that this is added. In addition to the aforementioned comment, there are some very minor comments which are highlighted on the attached manuscript. I look forward to receiving a revised manuscript soon.

We thank the reviewer for their time and overall feedback. We acknowledge the suggestions and have provided responses and made corrections accordingly, as per reviewer suggestion.

Page 2, line 18: Write number of males vs females in parentheses.
  • Response: Correction made, as per review suggestion.

Page 2, line 30: Add Standard Deviation.
  • Response: Correction made.

Page 6, line 35: add abbreviation after (DRI).
  • Response: Correction made.
Page 11, line 28: if abbreviated in the methods it is not necessary to write in full here.
• Response: Correction made.

Page 18, line 4: Should this be "incorrect".
• Response: Correction made.

REVIEWER 2: The paper is simple and well written, with no major comments to make. It is in line with a number of similar papers published earlier. Lacks novelty, but the information presented is useful and adds to the existing body of knowledge Some comments:
The basis of calculation of sample size or sampling technique has not been mentioned.

Comment: The basis of calculation of sample size or sampling technique has not been mentioned.
Response: We thank the reviewer for their comment regarding the sample size or sampling technique has not been mentioned. As we followed previously published papers this was not included.

Comment: Though the notable difference in number of recruited male and female participants has been mentioned as a limitation, I feel the second hypothesis should not have been made in that case.
• Response: Correction made, as per review suggestion. Second hypothesis removed.

Comment: In the section assessing athlete's knowledge on supplements mention of creatinine supplementation or hydroxyl-methyl-burate has been made. These are quite technical terms and expected to be unknown to common individuals. More than reflecting their knowledge and therefore the health hazard it might also convey the athletes were not given those kinds of supplements. Along with the knowledge their personal intakes should also be considered.
Response: We thank the reviewer for their comment regarding creatinine supplementation or hydroxyl-methyl-burate. We have included the following statement in the discussion.
Page 12: It should be noted that while there was a high “unsure” response rate to creatine and HMB (63% and 70%, respectively), these are quite technical terms and potentially unknown to youth athletes. More than reflecting their knowledge and therefore the health hazard it might also convey the athletes are unfamiliar with these kinds of supplements.

Comment: Though the questionnaire used has been adapted from published studies, was it pre-tested in the target population? Was it validated?
Response: We thank the reviewer for their comment regarding questionnaire? Was it validated? We have re-worded for clarity, please see below.
Page 6: Nutritional knowledge was measured using a previously validated Nutrition Knowledge Questionnaire (NKQ). Consultation with an expert panel consisting of a Registered Nutritionist; Sports Dietitian; two Academy Head Coaches; and an Academy Strength and Conditioning coach, was held. Each question was read out loud by the lead researcher and critiqued by the expert panel in a group discussion for comprehension, relevance and accuracy. If required, the wording was modified slightly to engage the target demographic of this survey (i.e., high school student-athletes; male and female; aged 13 to 18 years).

Comment: If multiple investigators collected data using the questionnaire, how was quality ensured?
Response: We thank the reviewer for their comment regarding quality insurance. We have reworded for clarity, please see below.

Page 7: All athletes attended the nutrition research session in the same room at the annual training camp. The NKQ was distributed to athletes in hard copy format with the lead researcher providing specific instructions on how to complete the NKQ, which took taking approximately 45 minutes to complete under the supervision of the researchers.