Response to Reviewer 1 Comments

The manuscript has improved. However, there are still minor points that need to be addressed.

Minor points

1. I like your figure 2, which is illustrative. However, I am still missing information describing the exact time points of the physiological measures. Please include this in the figure for both the heart rate measure (which as far as I understand was based on discrete time periods) as well as the EMG-measure (where you sued the total work period?) and also describe these assessment times in the text.

Response: Thank you again for reviewing the manuscript. For heart rate measure, we elaborated in the line 211-215 that “*The time periods of interest for heart rates (T0, T1, T2 and T3) are also presented in the Figure 2. Note that T0 and T2 were the exact match between the time of subjective measurement. Meanwhile, T1 and T3 for the heart rate measures were during work period just right before the break rather than the heart rate while the participants were not working and answering the questionnaires.*” Also, for the EMG measure, we mentioned in the line 237-238 that “…*MPF over the work period, and excluding the break, as indicated in the diagram in the Figure 2, was used in the analysis*…” Finally, the figure now has the heart rate and EMG measures within the study timeframe.

2.       Also include your assessment times using “T1” “T2” etc. in figure 2, so it corresponds to your results section.

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. These time points are now included in the figure.

3.       You indicate “Video” in figure 2, but do not mention using a video in the text. Please clarify.

Response: We removed the term “video”. In fact, we used video for another part of our studies. I simply forgot to remove it when modifying the diagram.