

Second Review 1

The authors have done a nice job with the main concerns, and my final recommendation is to accept this publication with optional minor revisions per the authors. Thank you for allowing me to review this resubmission.

Recommendation: *ACCEPT* with *OPTIONAL* Minor Revisions

The authors have substantially improved the manuscript and addressed most critical concerns:

- Abstract now clearly states the randomized pilot design, group sizes, and includes effect sizes with confidence intervals.
- Outcome handling for NHPT is corrected (binary analysis), and limitations for BBT are acknowledged.
- Statistical reporting emphasizes effect sizes and confidence intervals, with justification for one-tailed tests.
- Feasibility is documented (100% adherence, no adverse events), and figures/tables have been added.
- Language, title, and claims are appropriately revised to reflect pilot nature.
- Trial registration and COI are now clearly stated.

Remaining minor issues:

- Provide quantitative feasibility metrics (mean \pm SD for setup time).
- Address table formatting inconsistencies.
- Consider noting multiplicity limitations explicitly in the discussion.

Table Inconsistencies

From the updated tables in your files, the main issues are formatting and clarity, not data errors.

Examples:

- Spacing and alignment problems
 - In Table 2, some cells show extra spaces or misaligned numbers (e.g., 5 . 0 instead of 5 . 0 for BBT change score).
- Malformed confidence intervals or SDs
 - Example: 10 . 12 (1 . 0) for grip strength in the Traditional group looks odd—likely intended as 10 . 12 (1 . 0) but inconsistent with other rows.
- Mixed use of italics and underscores for p-values
 - Some p-values are shown as 0 . 02 * while others are 0 . 02* without consistent formatting.
- Footnote placement
 - The BCa bootstrap CI note is repeated but not clearly linked to specific rows.