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Reviewer’s report:

The revised version of the paper is better than the first one, and the authors considered all issues I raised after my first reading. While some variables of interest could have been directly included as co-variables in the analyses, the authors do briefly consider these variables in the limitations of their study, which is of great importance for readers. Hence, I am happy with the new version of the paper and do not ask for more revisions. While the length of the paper is important, and there are numerous figures, readers have a large amount of available data which might contribute to improve the effectiveness of future motor imagery interventions.

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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