

Adaptive Wakeboarding: A Case Report on Equipment Modifications and Strength Training for Improved Performance. The authors have updated their manuscript based on the comments. However, the comments are only partially addressed and responses too brief. I have concerns regarding this manuscript.

1. Original comment on abstract. Authors did not address self-direction in abstract or introduction. Since wakeboarding is not a mass participation sport (like running), there has to be significant reasons to warrant expensive modification to allow participation. This would be motivation – individuals are more likely to exercise in modalities they prefer. In this case adapting a wheelchair would be less effect than adaptive the desirable activity, wakeboarding. The authors include a brief statement added to the abstract but do not add supporting literature to the introduction. In addition, the authors added a statistic, 605%, to the abstract that does not appear in the manuscript. Unless the authors report relative changes in the manuscript, they should not report it in the abstract. I believe the McLoughlin reference discusses this topic.
2. The discussion is still insufficiently supported. The authors added two references Diaz et al., 2019 & McLoughlin et a., 2017. For the Diaz reference, is that a quote taken from the article? How do the outcomes from this study relate to that article? For instance, the authors note “By combining equipment modifications with targeted strength and conditioning, the intervention addressed both mechanical barriers and underlying physical limitations.” What about other research in this area that shows its not only the device modification but the intervention to effectively use the device that is important? Notably the McLoughlin et al., 2017 article includes the construct of self determination which the authors have not included. Further, the McLoughlin study is on elite athletes which is vastly different from the recreational participant. Overall the discussion needs to be supported more comprehensively by intext references and when references are cited, the reference should be discussed in the context of the case study’s outcomes.
3. Figures still lack labelling and sufficient detail.
 - a. Figure 1 should have labels for each component of the device.
 - b. Figure 2 should include dimensions of the bar
 - c. Figure 3 and 4 could be combined with figure 3 being a magnified portion of the modified wakeboard.
 - d. All components need to be labeled in figure 4.
4. The authors clarified the informed consent was obtain. Was the study approved by an institutional review board (IRB) or ethics panel?
5. Authors report that tables have been moved to results section, but tables still occur prior to results section.
6. As a request for future submissions – please include line numbers and indicate the line numbers where changes were made. For instance “discussion strengthened with

references” makes reevaluating the manuscript quite difficult. Providing line numbers with the exact change made is most beneficial.