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Author's response to reviews:

Response to Review

Reviewer 2 and 3. We would like to thank the reviewers for their time in assessing the manuscript.

Reviewer 1

We would like to thank the reviewer for the further comments on the manuscript. We have sincerely attempted to address all of these documents and hope the manuscript is now satisfactory. We have highlighted these changes in red font in the resubmitted manuscript

A1. We have modified the abstract as directed and presented the results in relation to BMI status first followed by gender. We have also reorganised the results and discussion to reflect this as suggested.

A2. We have modified the discussion, conclusions and abstract to ensure consistency regarding the condition of overweight versus obese and hope this address the reviewer’s point.

A3. We thank the reviewer for pointing this out. We have now explicitly referred to the model proposed by Stodden et al (2008) on P16 and hope this addition is satisfactory.

B1. We have included further information why this new information is needed within this population and why this might be useful and hope this is satisfactory. Essentially providing the individual test scores provides clinicians and practitioners a more precise means by which to determine where suboptimal movement may be based (eg in stability compared to strength/power) as no studies have provided this information in a pediatric population we feel that this data is useful and had based our decision to examine the FMS on suggestions made by Schneiders et al (referenced in the text) that such information was needed in pediatric samples.

B2. We have explicitly stated that ‘FMS’ in the present paper will be used to refer
to ‘Functional Movement Screen’ scores on P6 as directed.

B3. The reviewer makes a very good point. We have added what detail there is relating to validity of the tests within the FMS on P9-10. We acknowledge that the data on validity (other than face validity) of the tests is limited and hope the addition in this respect is satisfactory.

B4. We have stated on end P11 and start P12 how post hoc analysis was conducted following the Kruskal-Wallis test. We have followed guidelines stated by Field (text now referenced) and hope this add clarity to the analysis section.

B5. Results section: We have removed this information from the text and refer readers to the figure as directed.

B6. We apologise for the error and have modified the manuscript so this reads that ‘Results of this study suggest that functional movement is related to weight status with functional movement being poorer in children classified as obese.’

B7. Again we apologise and have removed the statement ‘As Burton et al (19) did not assess or control for weight status it is difficult to draw further parallels between their study and the data presented here’ and hope this change is satisfactory.

B8. Apologies, we have removed the beginning of the paragraph to avoid repetition from than included in the introduction

B9. We take on board the reviewer’s comment and have attempt to address this but we were not sure in what particular way the reviewer wanted us to do this. We have therefore stated ‘Furthermore, we also acknowledge that the FMS as used in the current study may not be the best option to evaluate movement quality in children in a field setting’ on P19 and hope this addresses the reviewers comment.

C1. Changed as directed

C2. Apologies, now changed to read ‘has examined the association’

C3. Changed as directed

C4. Amended as directed

C5. Changed as directed throughout

C6. Changed as directed

C7. References now formatted appropriately as directed.