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Reviewer's report:
The reviewer has still some comments regarding this manuscript:

1. If the validity of the apparatus has previously been confirmed, it should be clearly stated in the manuscript and the authors must provide appropriate references.

2. The discussion regarding the percentage of MVC must be included both in the methodology and in the discussion sections.

3. The fact that the FysioMeter software has a cost must be highlighted in the manuscript.

4. The authors seem to agree with the reviewer regarding the relevance of their results for epidemiological studies and also pointed out that extra work is needed to assess the utility for clinical setting. This point must be highlighted both in the abstract and in the full manuscript.

5. There are some interesting discussions in the response to reviewer section that, unfortunately, are not present in the full manuscript. The authors must have in mind that all reviewers' comments are probably the comments of most of the readers and that some points of discussion the authors had with the reviewers could be part of the manuscript, for example in the discussion section.

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:
Acceptable
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If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

'I declare that I have no competing interests'
I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

Do you want to get recognition for reviewing this manuscript?
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