Adams : Editorial review

Thanks for a highly original and creative submission to *“Best Network Science Journal”.* Both reviewers and the editor were enthusiastic about your submission. Before proceeding with publication, please address comments by the two reviewers, as well as the editorial feedback below.

* Can you explicate some examples of what you refer to when you say “many of the assumptions made …” at the end of the introduction? To better delineate for your reader which assumptions are based on your gameplay experience versus which are expected to be universal.
* Both reviewers pointed out the heavy use of technical language only those engaged in Lol might understand. Where used can you define technical terms such as “ESports”, “shiny emblems”, “toxic play”, “winrate”, “champion popularity”, etc. where introduced?
* More detailed discussion of the results presented, with reference to interpreting the role of winrate and popularity would be instructive. The data is a nice preliminary result and it would suggest logical next steps to more thoroughly interpret it.
  + Fig. 7 – 8, what can you say about the fact that both popularity and and winrate show similar trends in terms of active information? Is it notable that two different “observables” of a system have the same trend? Is this expected? Do different players/champions occupy the high information storage regime for the two different measures? Or are they the same? What does this tell you?
  + Fig. 9-10, same comments as for Fig 7-8. To interpret in terms of game play you might in particular look at which interactions had the highest information transfer (your plots 11-12 indicate it is not a function of vertex degree, so can you gain insights by mapping to specific interactions)? Where are Teemo’s interactions in these distributions?
  + Fig. 13- 14 are not too surprising but seem more likely to be a generic feature of TE which tends to decrease with history length (see e.g. the cell cycle papers for TE calculated with longer k). As you condition on longer histories for the target. So one could say less information is processed as k increases but you could also interpret the trend as demonstrated that individual characters/players have more predictive power in their own history as k increases. You more striking results may therefore be embedded in Fig 7-8, and 9-10 which do show some interesting results! I suggest seeing if you can get any insight by looking at what the nodes are in those distributions.
  + Fig. 15-18 – these plots are interesting, could you articulate a trend associated with nodes with low AI having higher TE? If so, what would that mean?