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Reviewer's report:

Test-retest reliability of tip, key, and palmar pinch force sense in healthy adults.

This is a good manuscript with clear and complete methodology.

I only have minor comments.

1/ Did the authors ensure that participants did not encountered any health/clinical/functional modifications between the test and the retest interval? Moreover, authors are invited to report the mean time observed between test and retest.

2/ At the end of the introduction, authors used the terminology "normal subjects". Please change it.

3/ The reviewer is a little sceptical about the reference 18 which seems to indicate that only 15-20 subjects are sufficient for estimating the reliability of quantitative variables. I am aware of other guidelines that recommend a minimum of 50 subjects. Authors should discuss it in more details in the discussion section since their restricted sample size is the major weakness of their manuscript.

4/ Methods of the warm-up activities is not enough developed and is confusing. Please give extra details about this warm-up activity to differentiate it from the MVIC. At this point, I have the feeling that the MVIC test is the warm-up test.

5/ Did the authors checked for normal distribution of their variables prior running statistics? The mean values in table 1, 2 and 3 are accompanied with a very high standard difference. I suspect that these variables are not following a normal distribution.

6/ It is not clear why both SD and 95% CI are reported for mean values in table 1, 2 and 3.

7/ In discussion, the interpretation of SEM values is not enough developed.

8/ Figure 2 is not clear.
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