**AUTHORS RESPONSE TO REVIEWER COMMENTS**

Comments from reviewers have been presented in **bold** **text**; and comments from reviewers #1 and #2 have been listed as C1.X and C2.X, respectively, with ascending numbers used to label these comments. Responses to comments are in plain text and have been labelled using a similar format (e.g. R1.1 indicates the response to comment 1.1). Where revisions have been made they are referred to using line numbers of the revised manuscript, and these changes have been highlighted in the revised manuscript using **bold red text**.

**Reviewer #1 (Ray Stefani)**

**C1.1: This paper provides a very thorough examination of strategies for low to high uses of the Super Shot during the last five minutes of each quarter when that two-goal shot becomes available. The simulations are well done. The paragraph on page 15, beginning with line 222, provides a very important summary for coaches and netball strategists, emphasizing the importance of team-specific strategies for using and defending the new two-goal Super Shot. Specific team-by-team simulations are well done. This paper is very important for Netball coaches to use to understand their options.**

R1.1: Thank you for the kind words made on our work. No amendments made based on this comment.

**C1.2: The authors suggest a shorter title, “Shot selection strategies in Super Netball’s ‘Power 5’ period”. I think the shorter title better captures the paper’s contribution and draws the reader to discover the results.**

R1.2: …

**C1.3: The authors must change all the numbered references to numbered superscripts to follow IJSSC formatting. Also, the information following each figure number should not be italicized. The authors should carefully follow IJSSC formatting rules throughout.**

R1.3: …

**C1.4: In my work on the USA’s two-point basketball shot versus the three-point shot, I found that about ½ of the two-point shots are successful and about 1/3 of the three-point shots are successful, resulting in about one point per shot. According to the authors’ Table 1, the standard one-goal shot is successful 91% of the time while the Super Shot counting two goals is scored 52% of the time, each very close to one point/goal per shot also. The authors may find interest in a blog I published with our NY Times newspaper, which I uploaded. A second-order effect presented itself when the three-point shot began. For the first years of the new option, teams would the select the best option of two shots instead on just one. The teams got off more shots than before with only one option, and scores rose, at about one point per shot, until the three-point shot reached 25% of the shots. As teams became more aggressive with three-point shots, moving from 25% to 33% of the shots, a team had to give up promising two-point shots, taking more time per shot, creating fewer shots per game and having lower scores per team, reaching the previous total, given about one point per shot. Of course, when both teams do the same, margins don’t change. As the authors mention, the choice is team-specific. I wonder if second-order effects are present with the Super Shot.**

R1.4: …

**C1.5: In the copy I was sent, after the references, additional but not numbered copies of Figures 1 and 2 are included. Following those are 11 pages of supplemental material. I do not think that supplemental material belongs in IJSSC. However, the authors could add a small number of tables to summarize important data from those extra eight figures, if needed.**

R1.5: …

**C1.6: The numerical margins in Figure 2 are very hard to read. Some margins could be placed in a table.**

R1.6: …

**C1.7: Page 3, lines 3 and 4 would better emphasize the new shot as “opportunity for teams to gain two goals per shot versus one goal per shot during the final five minutes of each quarter, referred to as the Power 5 period”.**

R1.7: …

**C1.8: Page 4, lines 24 etc. should read “ ‘the ‘Super Shot’3. This was ‘in play’ during the Power 5 period (the last five minutes of each quarter), providing an opportunity to gain two goals from the outer (i.e., 3.0m – 4.9m) circle instead of only one goal as before from the inner (i.e., 0m-3.0m) circle”.**

R1.8: …

**C1.9: Some pages have single, upper right, page numbers which disagree with the format Page x of y. Remove superfluous page numbers.**

R1.9: …

**Reviewer #2 (Hayden Croft)**

**C2.1: Line 10: Reword this sentence: “their scoring, but at a cost of more volatile and potentially low scoring.” Doesn’t quite make sense to me.**

R2.1: …

**C2.2: Query: Should 3rd person past tense be used throughout this article? Or is it acceptable to use “We” throughout?**

R2.2: …

**C2.3:** **Methods: There is not equipment section or reference to software used outside of the {SuperNetballR} package. What is this run with and how are the simulations run. As this is a Sport Science and Coaching journal better descriptions are needed.**

R2.3: …

**C2.4: Line 142-7: This title is too long, it should only be a sentence and the rest of the title should go into the body of text.**

R2.4: …

**C2.5: Line 174 and throughout: “adopting a higher tendency” reword to something like…. Attempting more shots from….**

R2.5: …

**C2.6: Discussion section: This needs some evaluation of your results against the literature to give context to the results. It reads like a deeper reporting of the results at times with no comparison to the wider body of literature.**

R2.6: …

**C2.7: References: The literature incorporated into this paper is very limited and doesn’t provide enough of a rational nor a theoretical background for the work and discussion. This needs to be addressed.**

R2.7: …