

Article information: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/ht-20-22>

Review Comment

Major weakness/revisions required

Comment 1: Line 77: The analysis includes aggregating data over each domain. The four domains and the USE questions that comprise each domain is not included. The reader is not able to reproduce the calculations.

Response 1: We have modified Table 1 to indicate which of the USE questions belong to the four domains. We also note that the four domains are defined in lines 71-72. We have ensured the calculations are correct as well.

Comment 2: Line 87: It is a little confusing to present the indication of a repetition without the definition of repetition. Is a repetition between two successive peaks or between a peak and a trough?

Response 2: We have modified the wording in this line to specify what defines an exercise repetition.

Comment 3: Line 122: Were correlations performed between USE scores and age or gender? If they were, please include analysis in methods section.

Response 3: We have presented a correlation coefficient as requested for USE scores vs. age and an independent t-test for USE scores vs. gender. These steps are explained in Methods with the findings presented in Results.

Comment 4: Line 123-125: These sentences seem more appropriate for the discussion section but need metrics demonstrating fidelity of the system (vs. video) in the results section to support them.

Response 4: We have moved these lines to the discussion section. We have also noted under Methods that the fidelity of the system was qualitatively assessed by visualizing the data with the web application. Under Discussion, we note this as a limitation and suggest a more formal quantitative assessment of the system's fidelity in future studies with larger data sets.

Comment 5: Line 132: Ease of use and ease of learning are described as the system's strengths. What about satisfaction? It received a mean score of 6.23 (0.02 lower than ease of use) and had a smaller deviation than ease of use. Why was this excluded from strengths?

Response 5: Satisfaction is now included as a strength of the exercise system.

Comment 6: Line 143: what is considered a positive perspective? Can you provide a frame of reference or citation?

Response 6: Thank you for raising this as a point. The seven-point Likert scale and its interpretation are described in further detail in Discussion to provide a frame of reference, making it apparent that the lowest mean values reflect agreement with the positive statements posed by the questionnaire.

Comment 7: Line 165: when the system is said to provide superior usability, what is the system compared to? The previous system or another system?

Response 7: We have attempted to clarify this wording by correcting it to highlight the system's usability as an independent strength, not in comparison to another system.

Minor weakness

Comment 8: Line 111: There are 15 items that have a mean score greater than 6.0, not 14 as listed.

Response 8: Thank you for this comment. This number has been corrected to 15.

Comment 9: Line 169: Journals are formatted inconsistently.

Response 9: Thank you. The formatting is now per journal recommendations.

Comment 10: Line 227: There are no panel labels for Figure 1.

Response 10: We were unable to add panel labels upon submission online. The panel labels for each image are indicated in the file name – for example, panel label for “Fig1a.jpg” should be “A.”

Comment 11: Line 203: “Assess” is misspelled in the reference

Response 11: The spelling has been corrected.

Comment 12: Line 241: The order of the movements in the caption of Figure 3 does not match the illustration/panel labels.

Response 12: The order of movements in the caption is corrected to be consistent with the panel labels.

Comment 13: Line 245: Please identify if the deviations are standard deviations or standard errors.

Response 13: The table's heading now specifies the deviations to be standard deviations.