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Reviewer’s report:

The authors submitted an interesting manuscript trying to standardize the significance of photographic assessment in body posture. Although their results are considered important and a large number of children were included in the study, there are severe violations in the structure and the presentation of a scientific paper.

➢ First of all, in the abstracts the use of numeric is not common. I would recommend to replace the numbers with commas.

➢ In the abstract the material and methods paragraph, the applied methodology must be described. Surprisingly, the authors are describing the aims of the study!! The purpose of the study should be analyzed in the objectives/background paragraph.

➢ The introduction section is too long. Usually, a brief description of the current literature that triggered the writing of the manuscript is used in the introduction paragraph. Moreover, an extensive literature review is suitable to the discussion section. For example, in page 5 the lines127 to 135 can be easily moved to the discussion section.

➢ The materials and methods sections and the results section are very confusing. When we discuss about methods, all of our methodology must be extensively described in the methods section. Unfortunately the authors are analyzing many parts of their methods in the result section. For example the statistical analysis paragraph has to be incorporated in the methods paragraph. Similarly, the institutional approval and the statement that the study is conducted according to the 1964 Helsinki Declaration, must be written in the methods section and not to the results.

➢ As the study has been approved by the ethics committee of Poznan University the registration number must be included if applicable.

➢ The aims of the study have to be described in the introduction paragraph.

➢ All the images must be included in the methods section.

➢ In page 9 the clinical method of calculating the TBF angle was firstly described by Cheng et al. As the authors previously referred to the introducers of all clinical methods, it is appropriate to add this reference, too
There are too many images. 56 is a large number and it could be tiring for the manuscript reader. I would recommend merging them in no more than 15 images.

The results section must contain only results. Nothing else.

The tables must be merged as well.

There are two discussion sections (!!!). I am sorry but I haven't met it before. I think that the discussion sections must be united.

Despite the fact that the authors describe their findings/experience in detail, a more extensive comparison with literature findings could be useful. Furthermore, many parts of the manuscript have to be moved in the discussion section.

In the last paragraph the authors describe in detail the advantages of the clinical and the photography methodology. It would expected to describe the limitations of these method, too.

Finally, the language of the manuscript must be revised by a native English speaker.

Overall, it is an interesting study, but currently it cannot be published. I would recommend a major revision and resubmission.

Kind regards

Dr Angelos Kaspiris
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