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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript on the accuracy of self-reported weight, height and waist circumference. Overall the paper is well written and of value.

Minor essential revisions required:

1. The inconsistency of spelling out waist circumference and the use of the abbreviated form (WC) – could this please be made consistent throughout the document.

2. The inconsistently of the use of social-economic status and SES throughout the document.

3. Edits
   a. Full stop in Abstract at end of methods.
   b. What is the footnote 1 in the 3rd line of the background?
   c. Second to last line of background – affected not effected
   d. What is VU University?
   e. Could NIH be spelt out?
   f. Could consistency be employed in regard to n = xxx – sometime n is included other times it is not?
   g. Consistency in decimal points (sometimes 1 decimal place sometimes none).
   h. Change “p's” to “p”
   i. Text between ‘insert table 1’ and ‘insert table 2’ – omit second and – “Body weight and AND height”.
   j. Sentence after ‘insert table 2’ – change first sentence to be second sentence and change the new second sentence to read “the prevalence of overweight and obesity combined was …’

4. Second paragraph of methods – I disagree that the use of these summary measures are good indications to ‘identify individuals’ – rather they are relevant as population assessment tools (as highlighted throughout the rest of the document).
5. Methods – the self-reported WC measurement is included under two sub-headings (study design & anthropometrics) which causes confusion about whether the self-reported WC was done before or after the clinical appointment.

6. Results - The use of ‘additional files’ is confusing

a. I think the range of ICC numbers could be included in the text
b. I think additional files 2 and 3 should be included in the paper (even if at the expense of the figures).

7. How many people were actually misclassified for BMI from the self-reported data?

8. Table 1 – should it be CI instead of BI?

9. Discussion –

a. comments on the limited nature of using education as a proxy for SES is required.
b. some discussion on the definition of “self-report” given such detailed instructions were given to each respondent
c. discussion on the overall significant findings given that the study has huge power

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

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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