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Reviewer's report:

- Minor Essential Revisions

The revised version of the manuscript shows considerable improvements therefore the authors should be commended for carefully addressing the comments from the previous review. All comments made on the previous review of this paper have been well addressed by the authors except one in relation to the calculation of joint moments.

1. The authors say that inverse dynamics were used to calculate joint moments and later say that a quasi-static model was used. These techniques are different since inverse dynamics uses segment accelerations to calculate resultant joint moments which are not considered when using a quasi-static model. Inverse dynamics is the most appropriate method available to calculate resultant joint moments but in situations where the segment accelerations are low (as would be the case in the movements performed in this study) a quasi-static model is a suitable estimation of joint moments. Therefore the authors need to clarify the techniques used (i.e. remove reference to inverse dynamics if this was not the technique used) and justify why the quasi-static technique was used if this was the case.

2. Abstract, line 19-20: there seems to be a typing/grammatical error in the sentence 'the resulting sagittal in the knee was an external.....'. Please revise this sentence.

3. Please check all referencing in the text and reference list to ensure it conforms to the journals guidelines.

4. Line 138; The word 'Rumanian' should be spelt 'Romanian'.
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