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Reviewer’s report:

GENERAL COMMENTS

The paper has improved since the 1st submission, and the authors have addressed most of the questions/issues the review raised.

However, one major point that involves both methodology and conclusions drawn still needs to be properly reviewed (please read the first point of the Specific Comments section).

Hopefully, you will find the specific comments below useful when revising your manuscript.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Major Compulsory Revision
(page/paragraph)

(1/3) + (4/1) + (6/2) + (8/2) + (13/2) Since motion analysis was conducted only after the BW intervention, the authors cannot say that BW training did not alter FW. This conclusion cannot be drawn and presented as a main finding because no comparison between pre and post characteristics has been carried out. This issue was highlighted in the past review, but the authors have not addressed it yet.

Minor Essential Revisions
(page/paragraph)

In general, the quality of written English and the readability of sentences can be further improved.

(1/3) Please delete “were” in the last line.

(4/1) Please change “health” into “healthy” (twice).

(5/2) Please report a measure (magnitude) of the reliability of these indexes.

(6/2) Please report the level of reliability obtained after calibration.

(7/1) How data were averaged and parameters estimated? Were parameters calculated from the average curve or averaged after being calculated from each trial?

(7/1 and 2) please check grammar (e.g. “… was refers …”, “ Software of…”,”…
(7/2) How was the application of parametric statistics verified? (e.g. how normality was assessed?).

(8/2) + (Table 2) The double support phase appear pretty long also in FW. Please comment about that.

(8/2) The last sentence appears like a comment and may be inserted in the discussion.

(11/2) Please delete “somewhat”.

(12/1) It looks like ROMs were reduced rather than shifted. Please check and comment.

(12/3) This paragraph seems to go back to the topic of balance. It appears there is a lack of order in the discussion of results.

**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.