

General comments

The aim of this study was to determine the effects of age and sex on joint and endpoint kinematics during a purposeful activity of daily living, i.e., drinking from a glass. It is an interesting manuscript well written and with a robust methodology, however some sections need some improvements. Please, check point-by-point reviews.

Specific comments

Please, consider the following point-by-point revisions:

- **Line 1–2 (Title):** Please, add the research context/target study population.
- **Lines 16–18 (Abstract):** The authors refer to "objective and exact kinematic assessments". Which one did you use? Please specify.
- **Lines 18–19 (Abstract):** The kinematic analysis evaluated the activity of daily living "drinking from a glass"? Did you only analyze this activity of daily living?
- **Lines 21–25 (Abstract):** What methodology did you use for Joint Angles? What test do you use to compare the kinematic variables statistically?
- **Lines 26–36 (Abstract):** Please provide the range of F statistics (instead of higher/lower or equal). Also, please provide the eta squared (or partial eta squared). Conclusions should be presented separately from the results as sub-topics.
- **Lines 39–42 (Introduction):** There are several types of three-dimensional motion analysis. You should expand a little more on the type of kinematics analysis that is commonly used, which is the gold standard and why the one used in this study was selected.
- **Lines 43–65 (Introduction):** What other ADLs have already been analyzed? Why did you choose the drinking movement? Also, the authors refer to various pathologies. This study analyses the age and sex-related differences in upper-body joint and endpoint kinematics during this ADL in which population? Healthy or with a diagnosed pathology. The research gap is not well delimited, please clarify.
- **Lines 90–91 (Material & Methods):** “[mean $\pm$ standard deviation]” – This information should be in the statistical analysis sub-section. Also, the selection criteria should be presented in a separate section (i.e., selection criteria). The variables hand dominance, grip strength and BMI should only be presented after the description of the procedures (sub-section one section for these variables). Also, clarify the materials, procedures and cut-off values used for each variable.

- **Lines 101–105 (Material & Methods):** Please include the link in the references. At this point you should only describe the ref of the plug-in and the validity/reliability values described in the literature.
- **Lines 110–117 (Material & Methods):** What guidelines or recommendations did you use to structure the drinking task?
- **Lines 151–152 (Material & Methods):** Please specify the power of the sample (calculated by G power); you can do this in the participants sub-section.
- **Lines 167–170 (Results):** This sentence should be placed in the participants sub-section (i.e., Material & Methods). The other results are robust and well presented; just add the qualitative effect sizes for Cohen's d and eta squared.
- **Lines 289–370 (Discussion):** The discussion is very well structured and related to the results. However, it should add the research limitations, future perspectives and practical applications.
- **Lines 380–390 (Conclusions):** The conclusions section should not contain quotations, but should be reserved for the discussion. They should be short and to the point, describing the main outcome (as described in lines 381–386) and the main novelty/practical application for the scientific and practitioner community. What is new about this study and how can we extrapolate these results for the prevention, rehabilitation and treatment of pathologies (or for improving quality of life)?

Good work!