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Reviewer's report:

The following manuscript seeks to establish a level of baseline performance of CP children in a Fitts speed-accuracy trade-off task. Although I agree that this is a topic of great interest that is lacking in the literature, I still find a one major issue and a few minor issues with the manuscript in its current state.

Major issue:

1) Although I see that there is a significant finding to the MT analysis, I feel this manuscript would be significantly strengthened with additional analysis of other kinematic features of the movement. For example, we are only given so much from the movement time measure and know nothing about how the movement was constructed in the initial projection, the movement reversal, etc. I would suggest a calculation of target reversal time, peak velocity, % time to peak velocity, etc. (similar to Buchanan et al 2003; Boyle & Shea, 2012)

Minor Issues:

1) Regarding the regression figure, the R^2 values are quite low and are not well represented in the current design of the regression graph. I would suggest a depiction of the variability be added to the figure.

2) The first 3 sentences of the discussion have grammatical errors

3) How was movement time calculated? The figure says MT= "mean movement time for each touch in a sequence of movements". Does this mean that MT was an average of the entire trial or individual discrete movements?

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 am able to assess the statistics

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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