Author’s response to reviews

Title: ANTHROPOMETRIC MULTICOMPARTMENTAL MODEL TO PREDICT BODY COMPOSITION IN BRAZILIAN GIRLS

Authors:

Dalmo Machado (dalmo@usp.br)
Analiza Silva (analiza@fmh.utl.pt)
Luis Gobbo (luisgobbo@fct.unesp.br)
Paula Elias (lamparelli@hotmail.com)
Francisco de Paula (fjpaula@fmrp.usp.br)
Nilo Ramos (niloramos@hotmail.com)

Version: 1 Date: 24 Oct 2017

Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Mr.

Editor-in-Chief

BMC Sports Science, Medicine and Rehabilitation

In attention to review, we seek to answer the considerations noted by the referees, and we move forward on other considerations we believe to be relevant.

Reviewer reports:

Reviewer 1:

Dear author:

Congratulations for this great job.

Here you are a few minor questions to review.
There are some extra spaces between words, over the whole text. Please check it.
Ok, checked. Thank you.

Page 3
Line 24 (1.100 g/cm3). Zeros at the end of a decimal does not have meaning.
Thank you, corrected.

Page 4
Line 19-20, it seems to contain "circumferences" twice.
That is true, corrected.
Line 22 lack of full stop dot.
Ok, done.

Page 7
Line 14, there is not a description of "S" meaning in the equation.
Ok, “s” is standard deviation. Included notation in the text, thanks.

Page 9
Line 19, the expression of that formula is expressed yet in methods.
That is true, we excluded that expression in text. Thank you.

Page 11
Line 12 Unable to found RT abbreviation meaning.
Residual tissue was written before “RT” on page 11. Thank you very much.
Reviewer 2:

This seems an interesting article, addressing a topic of extreme utility for the daily life of professionals who deal with limitations in the methods for assessing body composition.

The possibility of measuring various components of body composition through an easy-to-apply method always presents its difficulties and limitations.

In that sense I have only a few comments to make:

1- The first 2 references are repeated. I suggest you confirm, and if so, delete one of the two.

   Ok, the 1th reference was excluded and all others renumbered. Thank you.

2- In page 4, line 21-22 - What references do you use to make this statement?

   It was a previous conclusion from the literature. We included reference, thanks.

3- Regarding the sample, we know that hydration affects DXA assessment (Toomey et al, 2017) and that the menstrual cycle in women causes changes in the hydration state (Sharma et al, 2012). Were these factors taken into account at the time the studies were performed in order to minimize the error in the analysis?

   No, we did not account for that. But thanks for mentioning. We have included this issue in the discussion (Page 13, lines 10-14) as a study limitation, thank you.

   Regarding the revision of English in the manuscript, I encountered some errors. I therefore suggest a review by a English speaking native.
Page 3, line 15 - "children is not easy to..."

“is” in this case refers to assessment (singular) and not children. But corrected

Page 4, line 19-20 - "circumferences" is used twice

Already corrected

Page 4, line 21-22 - "These alternatives are more convenient due to their low costs, their low level of personnel training, that they are minimally invasive and have a good scientific credibility."

Grammatically speaking, “that” is not needed in the sentence, and it does not help with the flow of the sentence. “a” is not needed in the sentence as “good scientific credibility” is not countable, such as money. We enter the reference, than you.

Page 4, line 24 - "bone from fat or muscles..."

Done. It did improve readability. Thank you.

Page 8, line 7 - "Then β parameters (multivariate) were determined"

Corrected, thank you very much.

Page 9, line 7 - "Data not shown"

Changed, thanks

Page 11, line 10 - "have been used"

Done

Page 12, line 2 - "no significant changes are found"

Corrected
Page 12, line 8 - "Several factors can affect"

Excluded word, thanks

Page 13, line 15 - "generalizability" by "generalization"

Corrected. Thank you very much for notes.