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Reviewer's report:

Overall I enjoyed reading the article.

Methods- All changes required
Please specify why you chose distances of 250 and 450mm.
It would appear that the object was located either 20 degrees to the right or left of straight ahead. Were the subjects aware of this? Why was the 20 degree boundary chosen?
Please specify why a time frame of 30 seconds was chosen.
Page 7 last sentence states that all tests were performed by AK. In the contributor ship statement the authors state that DS also helped acquire the data. Please clarify.
Why was a period of 4-6 weeks chosen to retest the participants?
It would be useful to mention that most participants had been using the device for several years before the collection of data. It would also be useful to specify if they used the device all the time or did they only use it for certain tasks. Did they for example use the device when they were reaching and grasping in their day to day lives.

Results- Changes Optional
Were there any differences in performance based on the ages of the patients?
Successful grasps- For the scrambled condition participants seemed to get worse at the second visit? Is this correct? If so why did this happen?

Discussion- All changes required
Perhaps reword your first statement "the results of the study...." as it would appear from this statement that participants were always able to successfully grasp the object although this was not always the case.
Page 13 line 16- Delete 'to'
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