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Reviewer’s report:

General comments:
The subject is relevant and the article states clearly the purpose of the study. It is wellwritten apart from very few grammatical mistakes.

Discretionary Revisions
1. Usually there is only one primary outcome. There can be several secondary outcomes.

2. Did you consider a third group to serve as a control? Preferably providing them some sort of sham intervention.

Minor Essential Revisions
3. It would be nice to see data presented as mean (95% confidence intervals)

4. Please provide argumentation as to why the strength test of performing upright rows and shoulder abd. for as many reps as possible up to 50 is a valid approach to test for increases in strength. Usually a one rep max/MVC is the standard.
   How did you control for varying technical execution of this? Was it up to the tester/investigator if a repetition counted or not? If so is that a bias and a limitation to the validity of the results? Also, why did you not use the handheld dyno that you used in testing the neck?

5. Why weren’t the drop outs included in the statistical analysis? You could have analyzed the data following the Intention To Treat (ITT) principle, which accounts for missing values. In a RCT this is considered the appropriate procedure.

6. Why weren’t the investigators blinded to participant group allocation?

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.