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Reviewer's report:

The authors have adequately addressed the concerns of the previous reviewers.

The manuscript requires the compulsory correction of a few minor typographical errors.

Line 34. Should body mineral density be bone mineral density?

Line 86. split squats should be split squats.

Line 117. Average should be averaged.

Line 127. 'the follows' at the end of the sentence doesn't make sense.

Line 132. Should >40mm/s actually be <40mm/s. i.e. were the start and finished determined by no-movement.

Line 137. Participants should be participant's.

Line 139. Participants is not correctly spelled.

Line 160. Subjects should be participants.

Line 164. Subject should be individual.

Line 165. Average should be averaged.

Line 168. Subjects should be participants.

Line 213. Is RoM range of motion? If so how can this be the RoM of hamstrings - do you mean of the hip joint?

Line 343. Participants not subjects.

Line 351 knee flection should be knee flexion.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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Needs some language corrections before being published
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