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Reviewer's report:

This is a fine article.

Low number of subjects is a concern.
The way how to perform dynamic MRI is described and understandable only to specialists in the field.
No reasonable explanation was given on the discrepancy with the findings from Shalabi et al. [20].
The best is the clear conclusive statement at the end of the article.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes.
   With regardt to "treatment":
   How did you make sure, that only the symptomatic Achilles tendon did have heavy-load eccentric training, and not the asymptomatic as well?
   How did you make sure, that there was reliable eccentric training as demanded from Alfredsson. How did you ensure compliance ?

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes. A statistiscian should have a look at teh "methods" section.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes.
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.

**Declaration of competing interests:**
I declare that I have no competing interests.