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Reviewer’s report:

Dear authors,

This is a well written article. Anyway there are some concerns to correct before publication:

- (Methods section) It is necessary to explain more about the examiner's experience on these hand-held device and also on classic US. "Ultrasound scanning was performed by the same assessor using both probes" Please add a paragraph in this section about the examiner's experience. Did the examiner perform a training on these devices before the study begun?

- (Discussion) Page 15 "A possible solution could be to move the probe distally to encompass the entire 12 muscle, although this technique may potentially produce smaller values for cross sectional area". I suggest you to delete this sentence.

Page 15 line 1 "providedposition" please separate the words.

- (Images) The images you provide are insufficient for an imaging paper. I suggest You to add other figures. It would be appreciated to show the same muscle section evaluated on hand-held US and on standard US to compare images’ quality.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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