Title: Relationship between lower-extremity defects and body mass among Polish children: A cross-sectional study.

Authors:
Michał Brzeziński (brzezinski@gumed.edu.pl)  
Zbigniew Czubek (czubek@awf.gda.pl)  
Aleksandra Niedzielska (a.niedzieslak@opz.gdansk.pl)  
Marek Jankowski (marek.jankowski@opz.gdansk.pl)  
Tomasz Kobus (t@ehsol.pl)  
Zbigniew Ossowski (zossowski@awf.gda.pl)

Version: 3 Date: 14 Nov 2018

Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

below please find our point-by-point response to each of reviewers points raised.

First of all I would like to sincerely thank for such full reviews and the amount of work that both of the reviewers dedicated to our paper.
Reviewer 1 (Lin Wang)

Dear Authors,

Thank you for incorporating reviewers' comments to improve the manuscript. You have adequately addressed my concerns. But there are still some problems need to be improved. I recommend the manuscript should edit by native speaker to improve its quality.

*The paper was once again checked and edited by a US native speaker

- **Abstract**

I recommend the authors provide significant data in results.

*Results were added in the abstract – page 2, lines 21- page 3, line 2.

- **Introduction,**

What is your study significance? The question should be address in the last paragraph in the section.

*Added, page 6 line 6-8

- Page 4, line 10, "heal" is a typo

*Changed, now page 4 line 14

- **Methods**

The ethical approve should describe here.

*Added, page 6 line 23 – page 7, line 2

- The first part of the section is participants, not basic data, followed by anthropometric measures (not data).

*Changed, page 6, line 10 , page 7, line 18
Page 8, line 12, the sentence is unclear. Did three teams conduct the measurements respectively?

*The teams were working simultaneously. Information added Page 9, line 1-3

Results

Triple-line tables should used in academic paper.

*Tables were changed in to triple-line tables

Discussion

Page 14, line 8 "Chang and all., Pfeifer and all…”, the sentence is confusing, please revise the sentence.

*Changed page 14, line 19-21

Page 14, line 15 to line 23, the paragraph is repeated with last paragraph.

*Changed, Page 15 line 3-11 were deleted

Page 15, line 12-13. The sentence should be clarified.

*Changed, Page 15 line 23-24

Thank you for your review!

Reviewer 2 (Angela Evans)

Thank you for your substantial amendments and revisions; overall the manuscript is much improved.

* I would like more clarification of methods please - especially the valgus heel assessment, I suggest a picture please.

*Picture was added.
• I also request more critique of methods - however much this is common practice in Poland, the lack of demonstrable measure validity needs to be very clear.

Further, the intentions to include well examined measures (eg FPI-6) in the future should be stated.

*Additional paragraphs were added, page 16 line 22 to page 17 line 5 and page 17 line 11-24.

• The assessment of knee valgus in stance only, needs critique - foot posture may influence, and non-weight-bearing knee valgus would be helpful comparison.

*Added additional comment – page 16 line 22 to page 17 line 5

• What is being measured re knee valgus in children with increased BMI - thigh adipose?, foot posture? - both need consideration as limitations.

*Added additional comment – page 16 line 22 to page 17 line 5

• Page 11, line 22: please add this further and recent supporting reference for non-association of flatfoot and increased BMI in children:


*Added, Page 12- lines 8-11

• Please critique the current methods of the school screenings. Is this worth doing if not demonstrably comparable across time points and examiners?

What suggestions would you make for future screenings?

What is the point of screenings for children's lower limb issue; why not wait until a definite problem?

** Justify the need for this screening** - continue / modify / stop? Please discuss, with respect to normative comparisons; clinical significance.


You have really improved this paper, but please add further to your argument for screening - yes/no - and why?

How would you improve th current methods - be very specific, and reasoned please
*We added an additional discussion about the doubts in performing screening for feet/postural defects – page 17 line 11-24. We do not feel experts enough in the field of podiatry or orthopaedics to give a definitive call if a screening should/should not be performed. Nevertheless we would like to thank you greatly for that comment as this made us think about starting such a debate in Poland.

Once again thank you kindly for reviews.

Michal Brzezinski

on behalf of the authors