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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
This manuscript analyzes body posture in two groups of subjects with different age using a photogrammetric method. The results have some interest but the paper is not enough clear for the readers of a geriatric journal not specialized in this topic. More details should be given on the method and the results should be more deeply clarified, if possible, including a clinical meaning. In both text and tables the measurement are reported without specifying any unit. Moreover as the photogrammetric method in not widely employed, a figure could help to better understand the parameters (or some of them) tested. Actually, at the end of the manuscript a picture has been added but without any legend or quotation in the text.

Minor Essential Revisions

Abstract. The word alpha angle, beta angle and so on should be specified or replaced with their meaning. I would also suggest modifying summary with conclusion.

Method. Authors reported that the study enrolled 260 randomly selected women. But how? From the phone book? From a medical clinic list?
The exclusion criteria included a number of diseases without specifying if on the basis of medical history or other investigation.
The sentence “general accepted principles” should be specified and the method briefly described.

Results.
Following the main aim of the study, the authors compared young and elderly women. Afterwards they compared 3 subgroups of subjects derived from the older group. The aim and the way of this second analysis should be specified in the method section.

In general, the results should be reported in a clearer way. For instance, the parameters KLL and GLL did not differ between young and older woman but showed a significant difference among the three subgroups. What does it means?

Tables. The names of statistical tests should be reworded in English (or better erased).
The highlight in red of the significant values it is not usual and may be omitted.
Units should be added,
Finally in table 2 should be specified the meaning of p-value (which comparison ?) in a legend

References 14 and 24 are the same

Discretionary Revisions
The reviewer would encourage the authors to study the clinical meanings of their findings

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.