Dear Professor Jobson,

Many thanks for considering our manuscript and placing it under further review with *Journal of Sport Sciences* We are very grateful for your efforts in obtaining reviews. We are very impressed with the quality and constructiveness of the feedback provided by the reviewers, which we feel has significantly improved the quality of our manuscript.

We have made one minor correction adding the bias correction to the equation for lnRR and also just checked for consistency throughout the manuscript in use of the term “variance” to avoid confusion. We limit it now to places where we mention the sampling variance of a statistic and instead use “variation” or “variability” elsewhere. Please see below for our comments in response to some of the key points raised by the reviewers.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer 1 | |
| Reviewers comment | Authors response |
| I appreciate the time and effort by the authors to make the revisions. I hope this paper will help raise awareness of importance of investigating inter-individual variability particularly in sport science. | Thank you for your kind words and feedback. We also hope it will encourage researchers to explore variation further. |
| Reviewer 2 | |
| I still think that most sports scientists will not understand why ln RR is uninfluenced by SD. If you do not have a "feeling" for the ln, you will not be able to make sense of equation 10. This needs explaining in the text, because the understanding of this is vital for the whole paper. | We are confused as to why this is so unclear. The equation for the ratio of two means does not include the SD, and so it cannot influence it. That seems plainly obvious and shouldn’t require further explanation. Now, we did notice that we omitted the more recent bias correction factor in the equation for the lnRR and so have added this which does include the SD in its calculation. But we have noted this in the text i.e, that for the lnRR the SD only influenced the bias correction and sampling variance, not the magnitude of the estimate itself.  The lnRR does not constitute a “vital” part of the paper, but is presented as a complimentary effect size to the SMD and also because it influences the lnCVR (being the ratio of the ratios of means and SDs).  If it is that you believe readers will not understand logarithms (i.e., the inverse functions to exponentiation) then we are not sure that it is the place of this paper to explain this basic concepts. Certainly, there are far more complicated concepts discussed in the paper. Further, several figures already present the raw and natural log transformations of variables which should aid readers in visually interpreting the log transformations. |
| When comparing results in fig. 8 and 10, I still have to jump back to fig. 8 to remember what it said. It would be better to either have them on the same page or at least again state the results shown in fig. 8, e. g. "The results were, albeit slightly attenuated, largely similar to those found using […] with [summary of results here]. See figure 10." It is only a detail, and I would not reject the paper over this, but people want to read articles, not to turn pages. | This is merely placement when rendering in Rmarkdown and would be corrected during typesetting to fall in line with the journals requirements. |
| I think it was a very good idea to include table 3 in section 4, only it is not displayed correctly, please check with the editor(s). | We are not sure what you are referring to here as there is no table 3. Additional tables are in the supplementary materials. |

Again we would like to thank all involved in the process of reviewing this manuscript and look forward to the next round of reviews in considering our revisions.

Many thanks