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Reviewer's report:

The authors have made a good attempt to consider and review the comments made in the previous review. This manuscript investigates the reliability of a specific protocol used in balance measurement using a force.

While the paper has benefited from this revision, there are places where further revision (in terms of presentation) is warranted.

Page 1. Line 1: Rephrase “Many different balance..” to “Various”
Page 1.Line 2-3: Rephrase.“Although functional balance scales are easy to perform”. It doesn’t read as if it is a test. Can you please rephrase to indicate that it is a “test”.

Page 3: Line 22: Rephrase “......the duration of a trial in quiet standing is limited because of fatigue particularly for pathologic elderly” to “..........fatigue, particularly in pathologic elderly”

Page 3: Line 24: “and 3) we wanted a test that is feasible” Please delete “3)” and rephrase. As its stands it doesn’t read well.

Page 5: Line 12: “ for the evaluation”. Rephrase this to “To evaluate the performance of the cognitive task”.

Page 9: Line 8-9: “ From a clinical perspective our procedure makes sense as well”. Try to rephrase this as to “makes sense for what?”

Page 9: Line 12: “ variables varied”. Again make it clear as to “varied from what?”.
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