June 25, 2015

Jordan Bass, Editor

Brian Gordon, Editor

*Journal of Amateur Sport*

Dear Drs. Bass and Gordon,

I am pleased to resubmit the revised manuscript, “Health Culture and Running: Non-Elite Runners’ Understandings of Doping and Supplementation,” for the *Journal of Amateur Sport*. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to revise and resubmit this article. I appreciate the time and thoughtfulness of each reviewer in giving their suggested revisions to the manuscript. I have addressed and incorporated each of these changes into the manuscript to the best of my ability. The manuscript is certainly improved by incorporating the Reviewers’ insightful recommendations.

I have responded specifically to each suggestion below, beginning with Reviewer 1’s suggestions. My responses appear below each bulleted comment with the first line indented for ease of reading.

Reviewer 1

* The introduction is quite brief. I understand the page limit constraints for publication, but expansion here would be appropriate to better situation running as a dynamic and growing athletic endeavor, as well as the context of the study. Essentially, the introduction as is lacks the ability to draw a reader in to entice further reading of the manuscript.

--In order to better contextualize the project, I have expanded the introduction to introduce the healthicization framing and better establish my rationale for the research on amateur runners.

* Perhaps the most important and largest concern for the paper is the formatting throughout the discussion section. For having a healthy sample size, there are an alarmingly few number of quotes. This casual reference to what was said and “themes” from the interviews takes on a very non-academic tone and is tough to follow. This section needs to be completely overhauled, and I would suggest that the author(s) present a common concern or issues, and illustrate each of these points by a quote or two. Further, following the quotes, the author(s) should elaborate by interjecting an analysis. Essentially, describe why each of the quotes and themes are important in the discussion. As constructed, the discussion/results appear sloppy and are difficult to read. Further, it significantly detracts form the interesting potential of the paper. The author(s) alludes multiple times to quotes, however, fails to provide them directly to the reader. It appears that a plethora of interesting information was uncovered, although that is not conveyed to the reader.

--I thank the Reviewer for these suggestions on how to rework this section. While also taking into consideration the comments from Reviewer 2, I have overhauled this section. In doing so, I have split it into a results section that keeps the focus on the quotations and follows the theme, quote, explanation format recommended here. I have also added additional quotes throughout to better let the data shine through. I have moved and expanded much of the analysis and the supporting citations to the following discussion section.

* As with the introduction, the conclusion is rather abrupt and lacks significant detail and description. This section should be expanded to include a more thorough analysis of the findings as well as any implications moving forward. I also urge the author(s) to more strongly highlight potential changes to eliminate the concerns presented by the interviews.

--I appreciate this specific recommendation for improving the Conclusion. I have expanded this section to more thoroughly discuss the implications for health and policy resulting from the findings. I have also made a specific recommendation for educational programming that would address the concerns highlighted by the participants.

* Throughout, there is a lack of literature from the necessary philosophy and ethics of sport. This literature, which contains years of debates over PEDs, supplements, and bodily connection to physical activity (and running in particular) would substantially add to the manuscript.

--I appreciate this comment and have carefully considered this literature in the initial submission and again in light of this Reviewer’s comment. While the debates on ethics of sport as it relates to PEDs, supplements, and competition are indeed important, these issues mostly lie outside the scope of this article. My focus here is on the relationship between health, running, and enhancement and how perceptions of those relationships impact the behaviors amateur runners choose to engage in. However, I have added a paragraph in the literature review addressing the ethical argument advanced by Gleaves (2010) on non-harmful substances and have added a footnote with references to works specifically related to the ethics and philosophy of sport and enhancement.

* Finally, the manuscript takes on a very colloquial tone throughout. Especially in the discussion/results section, it seems more like sitting in a class lecture than an academic piece of literature. I would highly suggest that the author(s) let the interviews and quotes drive this portion of the manuscript and not their elementary analysis.

--I have rewritten the results and discussion with an eye towards this comment. As per this Reviewer’s earlier comment, I have put the focus on the interviewees in this section.

* P1, Para 1 – Is there information to update the running statistics for 2014? As one of the fastest growing amateur events, this number has continued to grow steadily.

--The 2013 statistics are the most recently available. While I would prefer to include the 2014 numbers they are not yet available, as these reports are usually published in July of the year following the one the report covers.

* P2, Para 1 – I am unsure as to what the author(s) mean by “health culture.” It would be more impactful to discuss how they fall outside a combination of the WADA and USADA definitions of PEDs as well as the social contracts within running events and the running community.

--In order to clarify, I have added a paragraph that defines “health culture” and gives additional background on the use of this concept. I have also added a brief discussion of the social contract as it relates to the rules of the sport in the literature review.

* P2, Para 2 – Move “Literature” heading to next page.

--I have checked that all headings do not fall at the bottom of a page.

* P3, Para 2 – This discussion on the connection of morality and running is vital, and an extremely good discussion to include in the literature review. I recommend expanding this portion, as there is a plethora of literature in the *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport* and *Sport, Ethics, and Philosophy* that specifically discusses this idea. Further, there is direct discussion of running and hiking (both on a treadmill and in the wild) in the journals. This connection is important to establish the desire of participants to improve their bodily and aesthetic performance. For example, see Hochstetler’s “Can we experience significance on a treadmill” and Hochstetler & Sailors’ “Lead, follow, or get out of the way: A critical analysis of pacing.”

--In conjunction with the comment from Reviewer 2, I have reworked the literature section. I have expanded the discussion of health, running, and morality as part of the expanded healthicization framework, specifically in the first two paragraphs of the Literature section. I thank the Reviewer for the recommended works and have included Hochstetler’s 2007 piece on treadmill running in this section.

* P4, Para 2 – “demonized as the choice of unhealthy, unethical, and immoral athletes” requires a reference. In addition, there has been significant debate over whether this is true in the sport ethics scholarly literature. It would behoove the author(s) to add in the literature from both sides to avoid any citation amnesia.

--For clarity, I have rewritten this sentence to focus on the stigmatization of the drugs, rather than the individual and added a reference (López, 2013). I have also cited WADA’s Code, as health and ethics are two of the three explicitly stated reasons for which a substance may be banned.

* P5, Para 1 – While the first sentence is certainly true to some extent, it seems that the author(s) are suggesting that if an athlete does not take supplements that they are not committed. Perhaps a rewording here is necessary.

--I have rewritten this sentence to more clearly indicate that supplement use may be viewed as a demonstration of one’s commitment to health, not that it necessarily indicates commitment.

* P5, Para 1&2 – Transition is very abrupt.

--I have added a transitional sentence to the end of the first paragraph on this page.

* P6, Para 2 – This deregulation came primarily from a push from Warren Hatch. The author(s) should indicate that this increased deregulation has been a fairly recent endeavor.

--I have added two sentences here indicating that deregulation resulted from the 1994 DSHEA and provided a citation for a review of supplement regulations pre-1994.

* P8, Para 1 – Remove additional space prior to Methods heading.

--This space has been removed.

* P9 – Why was the signifier “competitive” included in the recruitment. It seems like a more accurate portrayal of “amateur” runners would simply have a combination of different competitive levels. For me, this is a fairly large limitation in the study and should be more fully explained both in the methods section and perhaps by including a limitation within the conclusion. It also skewed the male/female dynamic in amateur running to some extent.

--I have added several sentences to the methods section expanding on my rationale for limiting the sample to only competitive runners. I also acknowledge that while this does limit the generalizability of the study, it does offer insight into the views and experiences of one of the many various groups of amateur runners.

* P11 – Remove additional space prior to heading.

--This space has been removed.

* P11, Para 2 – Blurriness (WC). Overall this represents fairly colloquial language throughout the manuscript, specifically in the description of the method. The author(s) should work to remove much of this to make a more efficient manuscript.

--As noted above, I have rewritten this section with an eye towards efficiency of the manuscript.

* P14, Para 2 – Discussion on caffeine is extremely elementary, to a point that it seems more like a casual conversation or class lecture than an academic manuscript.

--I agree with the Reviewer that the issue of caffeine and its role as an enhancement in sport requires a deeper analysis than what I am able to afford it within the scope and length of this manuscript. As omitting this brief discussion neither changes nor diminishes the central argument and analysis, I have removed these two paragraphs from the results.

* P19 – Remove extra line before supplements heading

--This space has been removed.

* P30, Para 1 – This limitation is certainly necessary and fairly well stated. As I mentioned in a previous comment, I urge the author(s) to consider a comment above in the methods about this limitation as well. For a journal like JAS with an audience that reads specifically for amateur athletics, this competitive aspect needs to be further defined.

--I have made the requested comment on this limitation in the methods section, as per above. I have also clarified the reasons for the including the “competitive” descriptor in the methods section.

* Much like the introduction, the conclusion is quite abrupt. There are areas of significance expansion needed in both that would more appropriately frame and conclude the discussion.

--In order to better clarify the points made in the discussion, I have rewritten and expanded the conclusion to be more specific and better highlight the implications of the research.

* Hyperlinks need to be removed from reference section.

--The hyperlinks have been removed from this section.

Reviewer 2

* **Introduction**

You do a good job in this section of outlining the research problem and providing some background information about NYRR. I did notice that you presented the findings here as well. Doing so at this juncture detracts from your manuscript, as you draw your conclusions before providing the requisite literature and outlining your methods and findings. I would focus on the research problem and significance in the final paragraph of the introduction, and move sentences about your findings to the discussion and conclusion.

--I thank the Reviewer for this comment and the specific recommendation to remove the findings from this section. I have expanded the introduction to better lay out the research problem and rationale, as well as to introduce the healthicization framework.

* **Literature**

While I appreciated the background information you provide in this section, I found myself searching for a theoretical/conceptual framework as the basis for your study. Having details about WADA, PEDs, and dietary supplements is important, but what theoretical literature and framework drives your study? I thought your introduction of “running and the running body” might provide this foundation, but you moved from this into the more technical and mechanical aspects of how WADA, USADA, and the FDA operate. This foundation would help address some of the issues I found later with your results and discussion.

--In order to improve the framing of the manuscript I have included the previously absent healthicization framework on which this project is based. I agree with the Reviewer that including and explaining how this underpins the analysis greatly improved the manuscript and better highlighted the main arguments.

* **Method**

You do a nice job of outlining your sample and how you obtained it, but this section would benefit from a more detailed discussion of your data collection and analysis. As a qualitative study, it would help to provide information about this approach (e.g., phenomenology) and the analytical steps typically used. Based on what you have done, I might assume that you used a phenomenological approach, which would dictate the inclusion of discussion items such as bracketing and horizontalization as well as supporting citations (e.g., Creswell, 2012; 2013; Patton, 2002). Providing these details would help demonstrate the rigor of your data collection and analysis.

--I have added two paragraphs with appropriate citations to better detail how my data were collected and analyzed. Specifically, I include a discussion of how I employed a grounded theory approach that required bracketing out my own experiences and assumptions of performance enhancement. I also further discuss how the data were analyzed following accepted grounded theory coding procedures.

* **Results**

This section offers some interesting findings with quotes to substantiate and illustrate your results. I also appreciate your interweaving of prior research into this section to demonstrate a connection between your study and other works. However, I found multiple instances of citations that you did not include previously in the literature review. These studies help inform your study’s findings, and you should address them in your review of literature. This will help you draw a stronger connection to existing work, bolster your literature, and hopefully help you outline the conceptual framework informing your study.

--In conjunction with the recommendations of Reviewer 1, I have rewritten the final sections of the manuscript. I have split the results into separate Results and Discussion sections, created a separate Limitations and Future Research section, and ended with a Conclusions section. I have also included all literature and references used in the Discussion with the other relevant sub-sections of the Literature review.

* **Discussion**

You have some good information and practical implications here. I would take time to expand upon some of your findings to further build up this section, particularly where you start with “Increasing athlete awareness....”

You also have limitations and future research in this section. You should put this into a separate section, and I would conclude your study with a Conclusions section.

--As described above, this section has been rewritten. I have built upon the previous findings to improve on the discussion of health and policy implications in both the Discussion and Conclusion sections.

I would like to thank you again for considering the revisions of this article, as well as thank the reviewers for their comments and suggestions. I feel the manuscript is much stronger as a result of these revisions. Please let me know if you feel further revision is required.

Sincerely,

April Henning, Ph.D.

Post-Doctoral Fellow

National Development and Research Institutes

71 West 23rd Street

4th Floor

New York, NY 10010