

Revision:

This review is relevant to 90967-1 entitled „Responsiveness of monopodal postural stability tests in recreational athletes”. The main purpose of this study was to analyze the responsiveness of the three monopodal postural stability tests in recreational athletes. The reviewer appreciates that the authors did a lot of work and provided a detailed analysis. However, in the reviewer's point of view, there is one main concern - Why the the program was introduced over a period of 4 weeks with an intensity of 3 training sessions per week? This needs clarification. However, this does not diminish the value of the article submitted for review.

The reviewer makes some additional suggestions (More specific comments):

Line 96-97 “A physiotherapist with experience in applying the test evaluated the participants.” Was the physiotherapist blinded to the study aim?

Line 106-108 “Thirty healthy recreational athletes (21 males/9 females; mean age: 22.7±2.7 years; weight: 70.13±12.39 kg; height: 172.5±8.1 cm; weekly physical activity: 438.0±170.4 minutes) participated in this study.”

Please provide additional information about recruitment process.

Let's consider adding flow chart including information how many subjects meet inclusion criteria.

Line 116-117 “For the stabilometric assessment of monopodal stability, the Dinascan/IBV P600 force platform was used with its software application NedSVE/IBV (Valencia, Spain).” Please provide information about the sampling frequency of the platform and what kind of signal the platform transmits ?

Line 274-275 “A possible explanation is that the balance intervention on the dominant lower limb favours it going further during the YBT when it is not the support lower limb.” Please elaborate this paragraph considering more potential reasons affecting the study results.