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Reviewer's report:

The revised version of the manuscript has improved. There are, however, still minor concerns which should be addressed.

Abstract

I would suggest to replace „the three athletes" by „three kayakers at different competitive levels" and add the application of obtained findings in practice.

Conclusion, the relative differences between the three athletes were similar for power, VO2 and forces at the paddle. There were, however, dramatic differences in the forces applied at the footrest.

Methods

Specify inclusion and exclusion criteria for subjects to be allocated to the study.

Page 5, lines 10-12: Three female kayakers (age range 20-29 years, weight range 67.6-74.9 kg, height range 169-180 cm) volunteered to participate in the study. All three subjects are members of a national team one junior kayaker, one national elite kayaker and one international elite kayaker.

Results

Specify "similar relative differences between the three athletes" in the case of power and forces at the paddle (e.g. a comparison of 155 and 235 W).

Page 6, lines 15-17: The relative differences between the three athletes were similar for power (At All-out 155; 182; 235 W), VO2peak (at All-out 3.2; 3.3; 3.9 L/minute) and forces at the paddle (At All out144; 183; 192 N).
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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