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Reviewer's report:

Dear Dr Ohya and colleagues,

I was a pleasure to review the article, 'The effect of a running task on muscle shear elastic modulus of posterior lower leg', for possible publication in the Foot and Ankle Journal.

The authors should be congratulated in how they conducted this research. I only have minor comments prior to publication.

- Page 4, line 54- Change 'long duration' to 'longer duration'
- Page 4, line 55- Change '1-10' to '10-point'
- Page 4, line 61- change 'method' to 'protocol'
-Page 4, line 62- change 'fully clarified' to 'clear'
-page 5, line 73- change 'is drawing attention' to 'has emerged'
-Page 6, line 99- Participants- were these individuals who were recreational runners or had were not undertaking any current running training?
-Page 6, line 112- Was the same person performing all the scanning? Was the same person analysing the shearwave scans? Was the person analysing blinded to the participant and when the scan was taken in relation to the scanning protocol?
-Page 8, line 156- Was the intra-class correlation performed for consistency or absolute agreement? Also and ICC (1,1) assumes that there are multiple raters. Was this the case?
-Page 8, line 156- Can I suggest you calculate the minimum detectable difference based on your reliability data? This will strengthen the paper and allow you to state that any observed changes are not due to systematic error.
-Page 12, line 237- Wasn't this paper performed in people without pain but history of MTSS? Please clarify
-Page 12, line 242- ‘were not mechanisms of’ to 'may not be associated with'
-Page 12, line 246- Not so much a comment to act on, but I think it would be also interesting to look at the temporal nature of this response and when these changes in stiffness return to baseline. May add some understanding around periodisation of loading.

Kind regards,

Sean Docking
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