Response to Reviewer 1 Comments

Thank you very much for providing important comments. We are thankful for the time and energy you expended. Our responses to your comments are as follow:

Point 1: Why did the authors attribute the reduced d-ROM values in the study 1 to kiwifruits intake? It is reported that the levels of markers of muscle lipid and protein oxidation are reduced by training while antioxidant enzymes activity are increased (Venditti et al, 2014). So could running be responsible for the adaptive muscle response and the reduced d-ROM values, being a regular aerobic activity?

Response 1: Thank you for your comment. We attributed the reduced d-ROM values to kiwifruit intake, because the reduced d-ROM values were only in the intake group.
Indeed, it is reported that the levels of markers of muscle lipid and protein oxidation are reduced by training while antioxidant enzymes activity are increased (Venditti et al, 2014). In the case of trained rats, it is also reported that acute exercise cannot be expected to further increase antioxidant activity. (Oh-ishi S, 1997). Thus, the d-ROMs may be reduced by the adaptive muscle responses of regular training. However, in this study, the subjects (the intake group and the control group) were running even pre-intervention and continued to run during the intervention. The intake group and the control group are same running team. We think their living environment and exercise level were about the same. Therefore, it is difficult to think that the d-ROMs may have reduced by the adaptive muscle responses of regular training in this Study.
We think it was necessary to investigate the amount of practice such as running mileage to clarify (the limitation, p.10, lines 318).

We have added the above description in the Discussion section. (p.9, lines 279-286)

Point 2: In the Introduction section, lines 32-36, the authors should define the reactive oxygen species (ROS) and when an oxidative stress condition occurs (I suggest reading Di Meo et al., 2019; Venditti et al., 2015). They talk about oxidative stress without defining it (line 36).

Response 2: We agree with you and have incorporated this suggestion by the Introduction section (p.1, lines 34-42). We have removed the text used in the Discussion section (p.9, lines 286-290) and added it to the Introduction section. Because it was a description of the oxidative stress condition.

Point 3: In the Introduction section, the references 3-5 describe only the negative influence of Vitamin C on exercise performance. Please also add vitamin E effects on the traininig (I suggest reading Venditti et al., 2014; Venditti et al., 2015).

Response 3: We agree with you and have added the references in the Introduction section (p.2, line 52).

Point 4: “Materials and methods, Subjects”: please underlie that the subjects continue to run during the intervention. I think that in the text this concept is not so clear.

Response 4: Thank you for your suggestion. We agree with you and have added "they continue to run during the intervention". (p.4, line 77).

Point 5: Lines 85-87: please add references for d-ROM test, BAP test and BAP/d-ROMs ratio.

Response 5: We have added references (p.4, lines 108, 109; p.5, line 152) to reflect your comment.

Point 6: Line 180: what is the figure 1? I think that there is a mistake and the figure 2 is the 1

Response 6: I am sorry that there was a mistake. We have revised the manuscript (p.8, line 230).

Thank you once again for your valuable comments and suggestions.