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Reviewer's report:

Mandatory Revisions.

What is the hypothesis for this study? Are you looking for differences from side to side or sameness? Make a clean hypothesis statement, please.

The comparisons made for purpose of analysis are unclear.

P6, para 1,2,3 I do not understand what is meant by “The mean values before and after tuition..” etc. What does tuition have to do with the project?

P7. If the hypothesis seeks differences, then there are too many p values to use a p< 0.05 and appropriate correction for multiple testing should be applied. If the hypotheses looks to show that there are no differences, then the statistics should be redone to reflect a search for “sameness”.

Figures: There are no figure legends. Standard deviations should be included, not just means in the figures

Minor essential revisons.

P3, para 1, line 4: “This in term...”. Correct typo.

P3, para 1, line 7: “methods is spares...”. Do you mean “sparse”?

P5, Data acquisition – What was the filter cut-off frequency?

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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