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Reviewer's report:

The authors presented an interesting investigation concerning patients outcome and satisfaction in ankle sprains. The MS is well written and good to follow. However, there are several aspects that have to be clarified.

Major Compulsory Revisions:
- I am a little concerned about the statistics.
- Optimal sample size calculation: 36 patients per group seem to be a low number of patients (with a power of 90% and an alpha level of 0.05). Could the authors please exactly state how they performed that analysis?
- The authors performed many different analyses and used many different tests. It is unclear to the reader when the data was collected and how it was analyzed. Is it possible to provide a figure showing an overview of the several data collection points and a hint how this data was statistically analyzed?
- Which post hoc test was used for analysis when the overall repeated measures analyses were significant? Was the alpha-level tests adjusted for multiple testing?
- How did the authors measure range of motion of the complex ankle joint exactly? Which directions did they measure? How did they make sure that the (one-dimensional?)goniometer was exactly placed at the same position after 4 and 12 weeks? How was the movement of the ankle controlled? Otherwise a wide variation in the data will result with little selectivity.

Minor Essential Revisions:
- The authors have included many exclusion criterions. Could the add how long it take to include the 148 patients for the study.
- Supervised proprioceptive training: Did both groups received the same training and how did it look like?
- Ankle joint function was assessed using propriocepsis. I can not find additional information concerning this topic within the analysis.
- Table 3: Passive range of motion seem to decrease during over time (4 vs. 12 weeks) but the error in ROM is decreasing. Please clarify this within the legend or the table.
- Figure 1: Lost to follow up in both groups: n=10 in parentheses-this does not fit
to the number of analyzed patients (n=35). It should be 30?!

Discretionary Revisions:
-I would suggest to change Fig. 2 and 3 into Tables since numbers are better to compare.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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