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Reviewer's report:

General

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

The manuscript is exceptionally well written and is supported by a strong and highly developmentally appropriate design. The topic adds new knowledge and is likely to be cited in future studies. The intervention provided impressive and age appropriate loading. Results are soundly analysed. All the caveats in the methodology are cleverly incorporated into the discussion eg direct measures of weight bearing activity and limitations with DXA technology. Referencing is current and comprehensive.

Editorially I would suggest a few changes for improvement:

Abstract - Background, Line 4 - influence should be influences

Abstract - last sentence (page 3) - given the advances in technology could "detected by DXA" be added to the conclusion?

Background (first paragraph, page 4) The word THIS has been used six times in the opening paragraph - sometimes using the actual noun rather than THIS is easier to read

Methods - page six- rather than referring to "ordinary' class teacher, I would suggest "usual"

Methods - page seven - I presume the pediatric software was used for all scans involving children less than 35 kg at baseline.

Methods - page 7 - the CSMI validation was done with ADULT cadaver specimens

Methods - page 10 - line 4 - "a annual" should be "an annual"
Discussion - page 12 - line 4 - measure should be measured
Discussion - page 12 - lines 5 - 6 - The word "study" has been over used
Conclusions - again I would suggest inserting "using DXA derived estimates of HSA"

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests