Review response report

I trust you are doing well. I'm following up regarding the revisions on my manuscript. I'm not sure if there is an official "reviewer response report" document that I need to fill out (I couldn't locate one on the publication website), so I'm simply providing my feedback below to discuss the changes I've made to the attached revised manuscript.

I read through all 3 reviewer's comments and made adjustments accordingly. There are a few comments that I did not fully understand or disagreed with, so I'll explain what I chose to do as I address each reviewer comment below.

Regarding reviewer #1's comments, I made all the adjustments he/she recommended for the title, abstract, methodology clarity, tables, limitations, conclusion, and references. The only areas I did not make changes based on his/her feedback included the introduction and the discussion sections. I made some changes based on the feedback, but there were some comments that I did not fully understand or agree with. For example, under the introduction section, the reviewer stated that this section should end with a clearly stated purpose statement and research question. I did provide this in the original submission. However, I have re-organized this content into a single paragraph at the end of the introduction section. As the reviewer requested, I moved the purpose statement out of the "research design" section and into the last paragraph of the introduction section. This satisfies comments from other reviewers as well.
There were a couple comments in the discussion section from this reviewer regarding discussion on the application of the FMS on this population. I disagree that this needs to be discussed considering I provided evidence from previous studies supporting the use of this tool in assessing running populations from in-text citations (cited in the introduction and reference page). I also did not see the need to discuss injury rates in runners since this study did not explore the longitudinal outcomes of these runners throughout a competitive season. There was no evidence to provide on discussing this topic within the scope of this article.

Reviewer #2's comments were also very helpful; I addressed and corrected every comment he/she provided. Most of these were grammatical errors, which I corrected on the revised manuscript attached. There were no comments that I disagreed with or had questions on. I added an entire paragraph on the FMS (as I mentioned above) to the introduction section, which this reviewer suggested. This was a very helpful comment!

Reviewer #3's comments were also very helpful; I addressed and corrected each of the following areas: introduction (one comment I struggled with), methodology clarity, discussion, limitation, conclusion, and references. The only comment I didn't agree with due to conflicting comments from the other reviewers was the first comment in the introduction section. Reviewer #3 stated that the introduction was "too lengthy" and needed to be reorganized. I found this conflicting since the other two reviewers did not state this. Likewise, reviewer #2 actually suggested that I add a paragraph discussing what the FMS tool is, which I fulfilled. I feel that there is a need to explain all of these details since this is where researchers rely on citations and evidence from other studies to support the direction of the study design. This was the only comment I did not agree with due to conflicting reviewer comments and my personal and professional opinion on this topic.

I would like to note that there were some conflicting opinions from the reviewers regarding the direction of changes for both the introduction and discussion sections, which I addressed in the comments above. Just to recap, two reviewers stated that the introduction just needed minor revisions (which I took action on and fulfilled), while one reviewer (#3) suggested re-organizing the entire section. I chose to keep the introduction structure the same, but I added a paragraph explaining what the FMS is (see paragraph 4 of the Introduction section), and made revisions as suggested by reviewer #1 and #2.

I also added images in the Instrumentation section as suggested by reviewer #2. I'm hoping these are in the correct format.

If you have any questions or comments about these revisions, please let me know. I'm happy to add more clarification if needed.

I look forward to hearing back from you!