The study aimed to identify "mechanical properties of the forearm and Achilles tendon". In addition, nutritional status was investigated. How can there be a relationship between nutritional status and mechanical properties of the forearm and Achilles tendon? If nutritional status is to be investigated, it should be investigated as a pre-test and post-test. The status determination here needs to be scientifically explanatory.

The originality of the study should be written. It should be explained better. What makes this study different from others?

Is not "increased body fat percentage correlates with diminished mechanical properties" already expected, known and predicted?

The study was between 18 and 32 years (mean 19.8±2.3). While there is a range between 18 and 32 years, the average age is 19.8. Outliers related to age can be removed (such as the last 20% of the age group, 29 and above). There is a lot of range, but there is a clustering on one side. The data should be checked.

Myotonometric assessment of muscle mechanical properties and procedure: Adequate.

Statistical analysis

Homogeneous için Spearman yerine Levene yapılmalı. Homoscedasticity mi yoksa Homogeneous? Attention should be paid to spelling and scientific usage. Line 194: independent t test should be written instead of unpaired test.

Statistical method ANOVA was used. In writing, one way ANOVA is written. ANOVA means Analysis of variance. The correct spelling should be Analysis of variance (ANOVA) or just ANOVA.

"For CMJ force and power, there was a significant increase from the normal weight group to the obesity group. However, when expressed as a relative value, CMJ force and power show a significant decrease from the normal weight group to the obesity group". Aren't the findings in these two sentences the same? Why are the two sentences connected, however?

Why was BMI not used instead of nutritional status? Nutritional status should be explained. However, BMI was given in the study.

Table 1. Demographics, body composition, grip strength, and physical activity level. How was PA level measured? Until now, there has been no measurement or definition of PA. But it is in the table as PA level. The table title should be changed.

Percent body fat (%): normal: 24.3; normal obesity: 33.7

Fat free mass: N: 39.3; NO: 38.3.

SMM kg: N: 21.4; NO: 20.9. According to these values, a deviation is observed. What do the authors attribute this to? Could it be related to height. Height N: 162; NO: 158.9. Could this be related to this condition? There seems to be a discrepancy. This should be explained.

There is a difference between the values. But it is not clear in the tables in whose favor. Bonferoni results should be shown by marking a-b on the averages.

Table 2-3. Correlation value r and p should be given in the bottom rows.

	n		Body comp	Normal	Nwo	Ov	Ob
Force	142	r	SMM	0.59	0.19		
		p		0.02	0.23		

Line 280-291. Conclusions are given in the discussion section. The results should be included in the conclusion section.

Line 285. If there is a negative correlation, which value increased and which decreased. It should be written.

Line 292. Muscle strength or hand grip strength?

There are deficiencies in the discussion section. The reason for the findings should be stated. What does the author relate the findings to?