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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Comments

The goals of this study are sufficiently clear and the questions raised are important in the field of obesity and how to best measure it. The methods being used are sound but could be improved. The authors reported only stratified analysis, which are of course important, but a multivariate simple regression analysis to analyze the simultaneous effect of the factors they are interested in would add value to the paper. In any case, they should at least mention in the discussion why they did not do it. The data from this study are sound, however they should explain why WC was only measured for a random sub-sample. With regards to adherence to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition, they authors should make some changes as stated below. Discussion and Conclusions (particularly in the abstract) should highlight the difference between statistical and clinical effect. It seems that they always achieve p-values less than 0.001 but they claim their results are accurate. Writing is acceptable, suggestions are made below.

Abstract

1. The conclusions do not follow directly from the results, it is said that weight and height are both mis-reported, but then they say that Results suggest that self-reported BMI and waist circumference are satisfactorily accurate for the assessment of the prevalence of overweight or obesity. Please clarify the difference between statistical and clinical/epidemiological effects.

2. “WC” is reported without being properly referred to

3. p's should be properly named (pvalue) and 0.000 must be avoided (report for instance p <0.05)

Paper

Statistics:
As mentioned above, I would have appreciated a multivariate analysis

Results

1. Please change pvalues =0.000 to pvalues <0.05
2. Please explain these two sentences:

The prevalence of overweight and obesity was under-reported by 3.5% (not shown). The prevalences of overweight, obesity and WC were, respectively, over-reported by 3.4%, under-reported by 6.9% and over-reported by 3.6% (Table 3).

Are you saying that overall prevalence of (OVERW OR OBESITY) was under-reported by 3.5%? It is not clear how the first sentence relates to the second one.

3. Please explain better the following:

In the gender, age, BMI and SES groups, body weight was significantly under-reported and body height significantly over-reported and thus resulting in BMI being significantly under-reported.

Do you mean that in every category of sex, age, BMI, there was an homogeneous effect? As it appear in the next sentence?

Then you should simplify this.

4. Figure

Please change the label of the figure. I guess it should be just before you show the graphs. Furthermore, it seems you have 4 figures that you could perhaps name a, b, c, d, and perhaps show in one page. In any case, you should explain in the figure title that they refer to 4 different outcomes.
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