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Reviewer's report:

This paper is well-written, concise, and clearly outlines the gap it is attempting to fill in existing literature. The statistical methods are well-described, clear, and appropriate. It is scientifically sound.

MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISIONS
None

MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS
1. The word "provides" is repeated twice on page 4.

2. I am not an expert in health utilities, but I suspect many readers may not be either. Having read the paper several times, I still do not fully grasp the meaning of health utilities. Essential to the paper's impact is ensuring that the readership is able to understand the premise of the paper. I would suggest that the authors expand the explanation of health utilities so that a more general readership can more fully understand the meaning of these findings. It would be helpful to do this both in the introduction and conclusions. If this were a health services research journal, this would not be necessary. However, for the likely more general readership of BMC Pediatrics, I believe this is needed.

3. The authors do not mention a major limitation, which is that they recruited the sample from a primary care clinic and an obesity clinic at a tertiary care center. I cannot find anywhere in the paper where they report what proportion of the obese and overweight children were drawn from the obesity clinic, and what proportion from the primary care clinic. One would surmise that families attending an obesity clinic are much more concerned and, simply put, 'unhappy' about the child's obesity status, and therefore, if I'm understanding health utilities correctly, would certainly have lower health utilities. At minimum, the authors need to clarify repeatedly in the title, abstract, and throughout the paper that they are comparing non-overweight children with obese children seeking care in a tertiary care obesity clinic. My concern here may be rooted, however, in my limited understanding of health utilities (which then perhaps speaks to the need to better explain it for the readership).

4. Combining overweight and obese children into one group seems problematic, as for this outcome, one would suspect that the real findings would be driven by obese children. This speaks again to sample size considerations. This deserves
at least a comment (which I could not find in the manuscript as presently written).

DISCRETIONARY REVISIONS
None
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