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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for responding to my suggestions. A few points to consider.

- 45 contractions was stated in the methods but why is the new Figure 3A and B only showing contractions from 6 - 45?

- "The differences between EECs in part I and part II (Fig. 3A) in the whole group, as well as between LLLT and sham-LLLT interventions (Fig. 3B), were not significant in each contraction." I am unsure what you mean by each contraction? Was a simple repeated measures ANOVA completed with post-hoc analysis to determine a group difference?

- Figure 4A and B - the figures are easier to understand, thank you. The use of "0" at baseline is far more informative. Can the authors please provide the actual statistics to these new analyses rather than simply stating there is no difference between groups or treatment?

- As reviewer two has pointed out, it still looks at first glance that the LLLT group started off with lower torque and also lost less torque. Can the authors please address this properly providing statistics.

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.
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