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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:
None.

Minor Essential Revisions:
Introduction: A strong Introduction, but why include a discussion of Functional Ankle Instability, if your goal was simply to test those with LAS? Since you do not stratify your groups in terms of ankle stability, you should be more clear that it is not your goal to evaluate FAI specifically.

Methods, Participants: Some additional clarity is needed concerning the ankle sprain history of your subjects. For the non-injured group, did they have any history of ankle sprain ever (ie. longer than 8-10 weeks before testing)? This ties into the issue of FAI and FAI copers. Further, for the LAS group, it may not be appropriate to use the term “acute” to refer to an ankle sprain which occurred ~2 months prior, as some of these injuries may have already healed to a substantial degree.

Methods, page 7, line 117-121: Was the MRD normalized to leg length? Why or why not?

Methods, page 7, line 126: Why did you choose a fixed time (ie. +/- 1s from foot contact) instead of a percentage of the total movement? An individual who reaches slower/faster may drastically change how much of their reach is represented within that 2 second window. If you decide to keep it as is, you may need to add this as a limitation and discuss accordingly.

Methods, page 8, line 144: Replace “made” with “calculated”.

Results: Perhaps I have missed it, but was MRD different between groups? While the global variables are more relevant to your purpose, the presence/absence of MRD differences changes your “story”.

Discretionary Revisions:
None.
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