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Reviewer's report:
This manuscript brings original elements, previously very little developed in the scientific literature. The article is well written, very complete and the statistical analyzes are appropriate and well thought out.

Some minimal comments:
- Abstract - line 9: typing error -> edit "measuing" in "measuring".
- Background - line 57: to measure muscle steadiness I guess? Clarify that.
- Methods: line 44: AWB - FE -> define in full letters a first time.
- Results - Table 1 and text line 1: Why not compare groups statistically by adjusting for age, to see if the difference observed are maintained?
- In general: as the authors have pointed out, a major limitation is the sex difference in steadiness. Indeed, muscle variables are markedly different between men and women. So if the distribution is not fifty-fifty (which is the case), the differences and results observed in muscle steadiness between the groups could simply reflect the difference in gender distribution. Why not do the analyzes men and women separately?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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