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Dear Dr Lars L. Andersen,
Dear Mr. Reynaldo Aldea Jr,

The authors would like to thank the Editor and reviewers for their comments on our manuscript. As reported we acknowledged that our manuscript presents some major limitations. Regarding the minor issues highlighted in the Reviewer’s report, we have made all the corrections requested (underlined). We hope that this new manuscript satisfactorily addresses all raised issues. We appreciate your future consideration of our work.

Associate Editor’s Request:

1) the title should state the study design, i.e. "observational study" should be included: We included “observational study” as requested.

2) the abstract should clearly state that this was a pre-post observational study without a control group: Correct we stated this

3) the conclusion should state that these results need to be confirmed in a randomized controlled trial: done

4) finally, the authors should carefully check throughout the manuscript that they do not overinterpret the results: we paid attention to this point in the revised manuscript

Reviewer:

The authors have given detailed and careful responses on all concerns and the paper has been thoroughly revised, although the study still presents with some major shortcomings. These major limitations can however not be changed at the present stage and in spite of these weaknesses the paper presents interesting data.

Minor issues can still be solved:
What is meant by “to maintain an upright position” in the Sorensen test?

Sorry for this error. We meant “right”. The text has been changed as follow “horizontal prone position”.

Consider to include the information on EMG analysis details given in your responses also in the method section of the paper.

As suggested we added these information in the method section (underlined).

Consider to mention in the legend and/or in the method section, why the unit can not be given for fig 2. Both reviewers were puzzled so probably a large part of the readers would too...

We argued in the method section (underlined) why the unit cannot be given.

Many thanks for the time spent and your help.

On behalf the authors,

Arnaud Dupeyron