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Reviewer's report:
This is a good and well-written manuscript.

Comments:
- A validation against a gold standard (e.g. Jamar dynamometer) has not been done in this study. Why?
- Did the authors ensure that no particular physical changes occurred between the two assessments? If yes, how did they proceed?
- Only healthy populations participated to this study which could be interpreted as a limit.
- Figure 1 should be changed with a cleared picture.
- In the protocol, did the evaluators encourage participants (to get the best measurements)? Verbal encouragements have been showed to strongly impacted the results of strength assessments. If yes, how did the authors control results for inter-rater reliability?

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:
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