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Reviewer's report:

General

This manuscript is basically well written. The project takes a very simple, but useful questions, and uses good science measure variables.

-------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

It seems to me very important to spend more time in the discussion defending the conclusion that the H-reflex is purely monosynaptic. The literature suggesting multiple synapses/inputs to the h-reflex should be picked apart, and the authors should find some potential differences between their data and these studies. Currently the authors merely state that there are studies that support their conclusions and then they use one sentence to say there are studies that hypothesize oligosynaptic contributions. What are the differences between the studies? What are the possible limitations to those studies and these data?

-------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Abstract (Conclusion): This statement should be rewritten for clarity.

Methods: Of the subjects tested, how many yielded a clean H, M, and F waves? Did the 40 subjects used in the study all have clean tracings, or did you screen subjects to get 40?

-------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No
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