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Reviewer's report:

In the manuscript the authors aim at investigating if cleaners with neck pain have impaired postural control in quiet standing compared to cleaners without neck pain.

While the study seems to be well motivated and most likely is of high quality I am however concerned about the presentation. In my opinion the manuscript needs substantial improvement in clarity of presentation and quality of language before it can be given a fair review.

Some examples of shortcomings are:

- The title does not contain information on the design. The instructions for authors clearly states that it should.

- The design is not explicitly stated anywhere in the manuscript until the very end of the discussion.

- The questionnaire used is referred to as the 'Nordic Questionnaire on Trouble'. I presume that the authors mean the 'Standardised Nordic questionnaires for the analysis of musculoskeletal symptoms.' It is not good practice to invent new names for established instruments.

- The exclusion criteria are given in two different sections in the Methods description, which is confusing. Further, I guess that the exclusion criteria given under 'Procedures' may not be correct. What if a participant had had neck, low back, hip, knee or ankle trauma the day before the trial?

- 'The black spot' used as visual anchor is referred to in the text long before it is defined (page 6).

- Page 6: 'If the participant lost balance during tests by moving arms or feet from the starting position, a new trial was recorded.'.

This statement actually means that if subjects moved their feet without losing balance no new trial was recorded. Was this really the case?

- Page 7: 'The hands held a bar...'. The hands cannot hold a bar. Subjects can hold a bar with their hands.
Since these types of shortcomings in the presentation are quite frequent I haven’t reviewed methods, results and other factual issues in detail.
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**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

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