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Reviewer's report:

The authors tried to address all questions in their response and tried to modify the manuscript thoroughly.

A study protocol, technical information and information about the ASIA scale score were included as recommended.

The introduction/discussion was improved by additional information about training modalities and populations.

The authors are aware of the low patient sample size and mention this fact now in the manuscript.

Response 5 and the accordingly provided text makes statistic clearer. I recommend adding the covariate in the legend too. Otherwise, someone would ask how p = 0.14 can be significant.

(legend: Significant increases of 59.2 ± 15.8% in TTI in STIM+Vib compared to STIM for positive responders to tendon vibration (p = 0.13) and decreases of -31.3 ± 25.7% in STIM+Vib for negative responders to tendon vibration (p = 0.14) were observed, however TTI was not statistically different between conditions.)

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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