Reviewer’s report

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

Version: 1 Date: 07 Jun 2018

Reviewer: Lin Wang

Reviewer’s report:

General comments

The study "Prevalence of lower extremities defects in Children in correlation with body mass. Cross-sectional study of 6992 8- to 12-year-old Children" aimed to investigate the prevalence of lower-extremity defects among children in Northern Poland and to determine the relationship between these defects and the body weight status. This study presents potentially useful results and is deemed valuable. The specific areas for improvement are described below.

Specific comments

Title

I recommend that the title should revise to "Relationship between lower-extremity defects and body mass among Polish children: A cross-sectional study"

Abstract

The methods should be reinforce.

Introduction

This section must be recast. The background provided in the manuscript is insufficient to support the significance and rationale of the study. Furthermore, the research gap is not identified. The problem should be derived from the theory and reviewed literature. An eloquent statement should be provided in this section.

What is main finding in previous similar studies?

What are the characteristics of your investigating population compared with population in previous studies?
Line 36: This study aims to evaluate the relationship, not the risk, between lower-extremity defects and body mass.

Methods

This section should be written in the following order: participants, anthropometric measures, statistical analysis.

In Table 2, I cannot find any measurement for these lower-extremity defects. The measures, detail, and definitions of different lower-extremity defects should be described here. Furthermore, flat foot classification should be clarified here.

I think that the severe underweight, moderate underweight, and mild underweight categories should be combined into one underweight category. Basic information on the anthropometric measurements of the underweight, normal weight, overweight, and obese groups should be reported in the results section. The prevalence of underweight, overweight, and obesity cases should be reported.

Results

A triple-line table is appropriate in text.

The comparison on the prevalence of different lower-extremity defects among the different groups should be reported here.

Discussion

Line 31 to 38: The prevalence of lower-extremity defects is lower in this study than in previous studies. I think the authors should provide the prevalence of lower-extremity defects in previous studies. Furthermore, what caused the low prevalence of lower-extremity defects in the current study? One of possible reasons behind this result is the difference in the prevalence of different body weight statuses. The same reason may be used to explain the gender discrepancy on the prevalence of lower-extremity defects.

Page 2 of this section, Line 33 to 34: This sentence is confusing, please clarify it.

What is difference between lower-extremity defects and postural defects?

Conclusion

The last sentence should be removed.
Abbreviations

DEXA and IOTF were used only once in the text; therefore, the abbreviations should be removed.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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