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The title is reflecting the content.
The abstract is a fair summary of the study.

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

Essential Revisions

Abstract
1. “Results
1. Please spell out PILE

Results
1. Muscle endurance test short neck flexors
P 11. How did they measure the time in seconds are they reliable?
2. P.12 .“ in general the description of the study and study population was sufficient.” Please elaborate this. How to evaluate and what is the criteria for “sufficient”?
3. Dynamometry
P.13 “ The study contained three different kinds of instruments”
What are these instruments?
P.13“However, the study design of all three is incomplete”
Please elaborate this in what way are they incomplete.

Discussion
1. P.14 . “ The patient in crook-lying and monitoring the chin tuck can be advised…..”
The authors should emphasize the importance of head lift for the endurance test but not the chin tuck..
2. P.15 “The cervical PILE test can be recommended as a functional lifting test....”

More details should be given to justify this according to table 3.

3. P.15 “Three studies ....but information on the study design is lacking”

What information is lacking, please elaborate.

4. P15. “the validity of the test has not been investigated”

Contrast group comparison is a test of validity e.g. study 22 and others.

5. How about other test e.g. Dynamometry and manual test, the author should give some comments on these tests based on what they found.

Quality of written English
- Acceptable

Statistical review
- No
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