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Reviewer’s report:

This is a simple but a well presented study which will have an impact on clinical practice. The authors provide enough information which outlines the due diligence within this study. Whilst I don't have a lot of technical criticisms and issues, I would like the authors to consider the following which mostly relates to presentation issues. I think this will improve the readability of the manuscript and its reach.

* Please revisit the abstract. Remove the aims from the methods. As it stands, the abstract doesn't do justice to the work you have completed.

* Your overall aim is to present a structured method for recording posture and its changes using digital photography. This is clear and you have achieved it. However, because of the way you have presented your introduction, it loses focus. I like using subheadings - please revisit this section and remove descriptive sentences and include a clear critique which highlights the need for such a study.

* In terms of methods, please consider moving some of the figures and the description to supplementary material which will keep the reader interested.

* In terms of section 3.2; again please consider providing an overall table and move individual tables to supplementary section.

* I suggest you revisit and move section 3.3 as a part of discussion - this will improve the flow of the paper.

* You currently have two discussion sections? My suggestion will be to combine some of 3, 4 and 5. This will improve the paper enormously. In addition the conclusion section needs to be part of this too. In my opinion, I don't think you need a conclusion section for the paper. You are not concluding anything - you are describing a method for others to use. If you want to keep it - please make is succinct and indicate that you have developed and validated a tool.
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