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Dear authors:

It has been a pleasure to review your paper about "Quantitative evaluation method for clarifying ankle plantar flexion angles using anterior drawer and inversion stress tests: a cross-sectional study" but I have observed a few of methodology errors that it's necessary to change before to be accept it

You can see below the recommendation

In section abstract

The method it is no clear, the sample don't coincide with the analysis, Can you explain better this? You can give more information in this part of the abstract

In the background section

Can you include the comparative data of other ligaments? You show the percentage of the ATFL but not the rest of the ligaments

In section method

I'm sorry but I don't understand the sample, I think that in the CAI group is because the ankle were injuries but in the control group why do you analysis 22 men but only 30 ankle or the same in the women? Can you clarify this?

Can you include the number and the name of ethic committee?
Can you include the viability of this tool the Telos stress device (Aimedic MMT Co., Ltd., Tokyo, Japan) and the joint angle meter (Takase Medical Co., Ltd., Tokyo, Japan)

How did you calculate the sample size, can you include this in the text?

Statistical analysis

How was the test about the normality? Can you include this information?
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