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Reviewer's report:

General

The manuscript has improved considerably. Nevertheless, there are some remaining issues.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. The authors have now presented statistical tests to support their claims. Details on how these tests were performed are lacking, however. The method-section only says that "Analysis of variance was used." It is necessary to give more details on how this was done.
2. To my regret, the authors have chosen not to follow my suggestion to take into account the interdependence of the measures of the left and right ankle. This issue is not discussed in the paper. I find it necessary that the authors acknowledge the interdependence and mention this as a possible limitation of their study.
3. The first sentence of the final conclusion in the Discussion is unclear. '..... variable within observers, between observers and between session, but ......' This should be clarified.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Page 7: '.... to gain valid measures ....': omit "valid".

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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