Dear Editor and Reviewers,

We appreciate your detailed comments, we have carefully reviewed and responded to all your concerns. Also, we once again submitted the article to the language department of the university for further correction, and there were minor corrections in the English language, which are highlighted in yellow. The rest of the amendments are in green.

Best regards

The authors

R1

Thank you for the modifications that were made to the original manuscript that was submitted. While the current manuscript is improved, I have the following concerns with the current iteration:

1. In the introduction there are a couple instances where the authors state that "According to studies..." (pg 2, line 52) and "According to several studies..." (pg 3, line 150) but there are no references included with the statements. Please include references with the aforementioned statements.

Authors: thank you, we have added new references accordingly.

2. Pg 4, line 198 - please spell out the "err prob" completely as error probability.

Authors: thank you, we defined it.

3. Pg 5, line 209 - how were the players divided based on their particular positions?

Authors: thank you, added.

4. Pg. 5, lines 231-237 - this needs to be explained more fully as currently it is confusing.

Authors: thank you, we have revised this paragraph, thank you.

5. Pg.6, lines 268-269 - this is an incomplete sentence.

Authors: thank you, we completed it.

6. Pg. 6, line 293 - what did the authors mean by "most delicate"? This seems like strange language to use in assessing CMJ.

Authors: thank you, we corrected it.

7. Pg. 11, line 407 - what did the authors mean by stating "more excellent"? I think the word to use would be "higher".

Authors: thank you, we edited it.

R2

The authors have well addressed my concerns. However, for the table and figure, they must be stand alone. Readers should not have to go back to text to understand them. Thank you for uploading separate file for figure, make sure to increase the font size for both axes. They are still hard to read.

No need for me to review again. I congratulate the authors for completing this study.

Authors: thank you; Done.

R3

The paper has been improved, but the main issue with the impact on maltodestrin placebo has not been inserted in the text as stated in the reply and should be added in the limitations.

Authors: thank you, added.