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Reviewer's report:
Bioelectrical impedance analysis to estimate body composition, and change in adiposity, in overweight and obese adolescents: comparison with dual-energy x-ray absorptiometry

Almost all of the questions have been resolved.

Page 12, line 275
“All three predictive methods overestimated FFM and underestimated FM and %BF com pared to DXA measurements. The mean differences were small (0.8 to 2.1%) and were not statistically significant.”

THESE VALUES DO NOT APPEAR TO CORRESPOND TO THOSE ASSIGNED IN THE TABLE

Page 13, line 312 to 315
Recommendation for Figure 2: at side of LINE oF BEST FIT, should appear the correlation coefficient and level of significance. So as specify in the method that king of CORRELATION has been made (Pearson, Spearman or Kendall’s Tau (recommended)

Page 14, line 325-328
THE EQUATIONS DERIVED ARE NOT RECOMMENDED FOR AN INDIVIDUAL ANALYSIS, why???

Page 15, line 345-254
IS A REPETITION OF THE RESULTS

Figure 1
Recommendation: at side of LINE of BEST FIT, should appear the correlation coefficient and level of significance. So as specify in the method that kind of CORRELATION has been made (Pearson, Spearman or Kendall’s Tau (recommended) 

Finally: Please, Clarify which is the advantage of the new derived equations
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