Reviewer’s report

Title: Assessment of anterior-posterior spinal curvatures in children suffering from hypopituitarism

Version: 0 Date: 29 Jul 2019

Reviewer: Justyna Wyszynska

Reviewer's report:

General comments:

- Please include the study design in the title.

- Please work to improve the quality of the English throughout your manuscript.

- Please ensure that all acronyms are defined on first mention

- The Introduction gives a nice overview on body posture characterization. However, it would be beneficial to the manuscript if the introduction is modified to increase readability (please check the grammar as well). For example, by providing more information about GHD, body posture of patients with GHD, examples of disorders in the development and functional abilities in patients with GHD.

Methods:

- The sampling protocol is not clear. I can not see the sample size, why did you qualify 33 children aged 10-14?

- Line 116: were there any other qualifying criteria?

- In table 1 is presented information about BMI of participants, however I did not find information on how BMI was calculated.

- Line 134: please provide the exact names of the devices
- Reference no 13 - do not cite reports presented during the conference

- I did not find information about figure 1 in the text

- Line 160 - did you mean table 2? (not 3)

- the unit in norms in table 2 is missing

- Do the Saunders's norms (in table 2) refer to the population of children and adolescents?

- There is no information about statistical analysis

Results:

- Line 173 and 178 - incorrect table numbers

- Tables 3 and 4 can be combined into one

- Lines 180-186 should be moved to Methods section

- I did not find information about Table 5 in the text

- Table 7: in my opinion it is a mistake to compare 6 participants before therapy with 27 participants under the treatment to assess "if therapy with recombinant growth hormone may be a risk factor for postural defects in children" - as the authors wrote in the aim of the paper. First of all, a group of six participants is too small. Secondly, in order to reliably evaluate, the same group of participants should be examined before the start of the therapy and during / after treatment.

I propose to remove from the article all data and information on the impact of treatment by rhGH on body posture.

- I did not find information about Figure 2 in the text.
- Table 8: if these data are needed? These comparisons are not the purpose of the paper. Too much data reduces the readability of the work. The same applies to the results given in lines: 230-233. A better solution would be a logistic analysis which would evaluate which of the analyzed factors has the greatest impact on body posture.


- Discussion section should be improved

- The readability of the discussion should be improved by showing the interpretation in different/separated paragraphs.

- Start the discussion by briefly describing your results

- Lines 291-297: please provide appropriate reference

- The limitation sections is missing

Conclusions: in my opinion require redrafting. The research carried out by the authors does not allow for such conclusions.

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

No

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

No

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

No
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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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