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Reviewer's report:

Overall, significant improvements made to the manuscript that provides significant clarity. It was much easier to follow and the vast majority of recommendations were adequately addresses. I commend the authors on a paper that can provide clinicians with an additional resource to treat knee extension loss.

Major revisions:

Background, paragraph 6, line 18: I think you need one sentence here that summarizes Uhl and Jacobs article that PTs generate the greatest amount of torque and HIS devices produces similar torques. It provides a little more background why patients inflate the cuff similar to the pressure provided by the PT. This would help clear things up for me why applying a torque similar to PTs is relevant.

Results, paragraph 2,line 7: Your data shows UKA and TKA patients had 9.6 + 4.2 degrees at baseline. In the first paragraph in the background, 92% of patients with less than 10 degrees of knee extension loss can regain their motion, why was it necessary to put these patients in a splint?

Minor Revisions:

Abstract, Results: Did you run a mixed model or a GLM for your stats?

Methods, paragraph 3, line 5: same as above?

Background, paragraph 7, line 5: "The combination of higher force...." 

Discretionary Revisions:

Background, paragraph 2, line 2: Should this read, "Loss of knee extension after TKA leads to ....."

Background, paragraph 2, line 5, Should this read, "increasing load to..."

Results, paragraph 2, line 2: Remove "Both"

Results, paragraph 3, line 5: Remove "There were" and "that". Should read "Three other patients demonstrated..."
Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.