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Dear Editor,

RE: MS: 5298685033062856 - Validity of self-reported weight, height and resultant body mass index in Chinese adolescents and factors associated with errors in self-reports

We really appreciate your comments on our manuscript. We have the manuscript edited by a native English speaking colleague. And we make sure the manuscript conforms to all the formatting points. We would also like to thank the reviewers for their helpful comments. We agreed with the reviewers’ comments and have revised our manuscript accordingly.

Thank you for considering our revised manuscript.

Yours sincerely,

Hong Yan on behalf of authors

Professor in Epidemiology and Health Statistics
Dean of the College of Medicine
Xi’an Jiaotong University College of Medicine
P.O. Box, 46
No.76 West Yanta Road
South Suburb of Xi’an
Xi’an, 710061
Shaanxi Province
P.R. China
Our response as follows:

Reply to Reviewer 2:

We are extremely grateful for your review of the manuscript. We agree with your comments and have modified our manuscript accordingly, as documented below.

Reviewer’s report
Title: Validity of self-reported weight, height and resultant body mass index in Chinese adolescents and factors associated with errors in self-reports
Version: 2 Date: 24 January 2010
Reviewer: Nikolaos Tsigilis

Reviewer's report:
The authors have made a serious effort to improve their manuscript. Their responses are satisfactory and the manuscript has changed accordingly. However, there are some minor corrections and additional information which should be added before the manuscript is published.
P.4, l 60-65. Please comment whether prior attempt to develop correction equations were satisfactory.
Reply: we really appreciate your comments. And we have added this to the text. “These previous correction equations were satisfactory and led to more accurate estimations of the mean BMI and obesity prevalence compared to estimates that were calculated directly from reported values [22, 32]. However, differences still remained between corrected obesity prevalence and true obesity prevalence. This previous study suggests that equations should not be used across populations. [33]” see P4 L 74-79

In the results section it should be clearly stated that there was no gender effect, and thus the results are presented for the total sample. Moreover delete the word "by gender" from the title of Table 2.
Reply: thank you for point out this. We have added a sentence in the text and have deleted the word "by gender" from the title of Table 2. “There was no gender effect on the entire above index, thus the results are presented for the total sample.” see P10, L222 and P21 Table 2.

The authors should mention which index for effect they used (Cohen's d, #2, #2).
Reply: we are grateful for your comments. We used Cohen’s d as an effect size and have added this in the text. See P9, L189 “Cohen’s d was used as an effect size to indicate the standardized difference between means of reported and measured values.”
P13, L. 290-297. Please try to support your speculation with the results of prior Studies
Reply: the reviewer was right; we thank you for your comments. We have revised
this in the text. See P14, L 320-329 “We found adolescents living in suburban areas had more bias in their self-reported anthropometric values than those living in urban areas of the city. Previous studies have no information about the effect of area of residence on the report error. It is beyond the scope of the current study to interpret the effects of household economic status and area of residency. Previous studies have indicated that adults [48] and adolescents [49] with a higher socioeconomic status are more concerned about body shape or other peoples’ perceptions of their weight. Prior research also shows that rural students are less concerned about weight [50, 51]. The difference in concerns about weight may partly explain why household economic status and area of residency were associated with difference between reported and measured values in our study.”

Please check the grammar and the syntax of the revisions.

Reply: we are grateful to you for the point. We have noticed that and feel sorry for that. A native English speaking colleague has copyedited the revised manuscript.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
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.
Reply to Reviewer 1:

We are extremely grateful for your review of the manuscript.

Reviewer's report

Title: Validity of self-reported weight, height and resultant body mass index in Chinese adolescents and factors associated with errors in self-reports

Version: 2 Date: 31 December 2009

Reviewer: Frank Elgar

Reviewer's report:
All of my questions have been adequately addressed. I see no outstanding issues to warrant a second revision.
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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