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Reviewer’s report:

The authors should be commended for addressing all the comments from the previous review which I feel has resulted in an improved paper. The following are additional comments which I feel should be addressed prior to publication:

Line 165 and 166; Please define what each term in the equations are.

Results; I still feel that generally the way the results are reported is too vague. For example, you state "The SLS showed different peak angles in the affected and unaffected limb in both movement planes" but this doesn't specifically state which joints/angles in which plane of motion and which group was greater than which (i.e. was affected limb greater or the unaffected limb?). Please specifically say where significant differences were found and where there was no significant difference. You have done this at times in the discussion but I feel it should be in the results section. The following section is also very unclear; "Although the SI score differed between the environments, no apparent trends indicated whether water immersion increased or decreased the degree of symmetry in either group. Similarly, considerable differences in SI scores were evident between groups, without indication whether injury status increased or decreased the symmetry". Again, state specifically where there were differences and which group was greater than which.

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:
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