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PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

No - there are minor issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

No - there are major issues
OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: This is an interesting study that attempts to evaluate the effect of ACL kinesio-taping in knee joint kinematic during a vertical jump. The study design is appropriate and well performed, but it could include a control state without taping. The outcome measures seem appropriate but more details for the markers and the power analysis. Appropriate results, tables and figures.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

For the study design, this is appropriate for the specific aim used. However, the fact that a DVJ assessment can be associated with an ACL injury risk in a specific population does not necessarily mean that the efficacy of a preventative intervention for the ACL could be evaluated by DVJ kinematics only. Someone would argue that the proper way to study this effect is to apply the intervention and assess the ACL risk itself over time. Also, the authors should be careful with their interpretations.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

Introduction

- First sentence does not make any sense.

- Define BTS

Methods

- Most studies assessing DVJ and ACL risk are performed in female athletes. Study uses only male subjects, should be a limitation

- Preferably no history of injury at all, not only in the last 6 months

- Additional details for the power analysis are needed with more specific data. The reference used describes running and cutting maneuvers, not vertical jump.
- Details for the placement of the markers are needed.

- The use of a control with no tape is important to record the knee landing kinematics/kinetics as a baseline for these patients.

- Please explain more the control group. It is not clear to someone outside the field to understand the non-stretched kinesio tap

Results

- Is the decrease in knee abduction adequate to suggest reduction in the ACL injury risk that occurs in a combined knee kinematic pattern? Why all other kinematic outcomes where not affected?

Discussion

- The authors should attempt to provide further explanation of the fact that there were not significant differences in other kinematic measures

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

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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