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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for the positive response to our manuscript. We are very pleased by your decision to accept our manuscript for publication in BMC Medical Research Methodology. We would like to thank you and the reviewers for a very fruitful and constructive review process.

References to the statistical methods applied and information on the statistical software used have been included. Below please find our response to the comments given by the reviewer.

Sincerely,
Mette Rasmussen

Reviewer's report

Title: Validity of self-reported height and weight among adolescents: The importance of reporting capability

Version: 3
Date: 23 April 2013
Reviewer: Manfred Stommel

Reviewer's report:
Discretionary Revisions:
(1) In the discussion section (p.12) you write: “While no systematic difference in misclassification of weight by response capability was detected among boys, both among boys and girls the results indicate a larger reporting error (random measurement error) among students with low response capability.” It's not clear what you mean by “misclassification,” since you report mean differences between
self-reported and measured weight in Table 2 and Table 5.

RESPONSE: WE RECOGNIZE THAT THIS WORDING WAS NOT VERY PRECISE. WE HAVE NOW REVISED THE TEXT TO BE MORE SPECIFIC.

(2) Language improvements:
p.5: We dichotomised weighing history into being weighed ‘within the past month’ (recently) versus ‘more than one month ago’ + ‘don’t remember’ (not recently). Height measuring history was dichotomized into being measured ‘within the past half year’ (recently) versus ‘more than half a year ago’ + ‘don’t remember’ (not recently).

=>We dichotomized weighing history into being weighed ‘within the past month’ (recently) versus the combined ‘more than one month ago’ and ‘don’t remember’ categories (not recently). Height measuring history was dichotomized into being measured ‘within the past half year’ (recently) versus the combined ‘more than half a year ago’ and ‘don’t remember’ categories (not recently).

RESPONSE: WE HAVE REVISED THE TEXT ACCORDINGLY

p.8: Therefore, secondly analyses also adjusted by measured weight and height, respectively, were conducted.

=>Therefore, secondly analyses also adjusted by measured weight and height, respectively, were conducted.

RESPONSE: WE ARE UNCERTAIN ABOUT THE REQUESTED CHANGES TO THE TEXT. PERHAPS THE REVIEWER IS WILLING TO PROVIDE US WITH MORE DETAILS.

p. 8: Generally, marked differences were observed between boys and girls and all analyses were therefore conducted stratified by gender. The modifying effect of gender was also tested by inclusion of an interaction term in the multivariate analyses.

=>Generally, since marked differences were observed between boys and girls, all analyses were therefore conducted separately by gender. The modifying effect of gender was also tested by inclusion of an interaction term in the multivariate analyses.

RESPONSE: WE HAVE REVISED THE TEXT ACCORDINGLY

p.13: Conclusively, among both boys and girls low response capability seems to be associated with a larger random measurement error while a systematic underestimation of BMI z-score and
overweight prevalence due to low response capability was only observed among girls.

=> Among both boys and girls low response capability seems to be consistently associated with a larger random measurement error while a systematic underestimation of BMI z-score and overweight prevalence due to low response capability was only observed among girls.

RESPONSE: WE HAVE REVISED THE TEXT ACCORDINGLY

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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FINALLY, WE WOULD LIKE TO EXPRESS OUR GRATITUDE TO PROFESSOR STOMMEL FOR A VERY CONSTRUCTIVE AND POSITIVE REVIEW PROCESS. THANK YOU!