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Reviewer's report:

The authors have improved the manuscript with the corrections that they have made. However, I have a small number of corrections that I would like the authors to implement before accepting the manuscript.

Replace the word 'subject' with 'participant' throughout the manuscript.

Abstract, line 37: Provide a brief description of the different squat positions i.e. '…performed 9 different variations of squats (3 stance widths, 3 foot angles)…'

Abstract, line 42: Change '…and between the subjects' level of experience with strength training exercises as follows. Increasing…' to '…and between the subjects' level of experience with the squat exercise as follows: increasing foot angle led to an increased…' and simply separate the two sentences that follow with a semi colon.

Background, line 94: Change '…general now injury risk…' to '…general low injury risk…'

Methods, line 177: Change 'randomised' to 'randomized' to ensure consistent spelling (you spell 'minimize' and 'standardized' in line 183 and 'standardized' in line 199).

Results, line 271: Change 'The novice showed…' to 'The novice group showed…'

Results, line 272: Change '…while the within the experienced…' to '…while within the experienced…'

Discussion, line 312: Change 'The here chosen…' to 'The extra load of 0% for novice and 50% for experienced squatters chosen here represents…'

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?  
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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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Quality of written English  
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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