Author's response to reviews

Title: Validation of self-reported anthropometrics in the Adventist Health Study 2

Authors:

Maira Bes-Rastrollo (mbes@unav.es)
Joan Sabate (jsabate@llu.edu)
Karen Jaceldo-Siegl (kjaceldo@llu.edu)
Gary E Fraser (gfraser@llu.edu)

Version: 2 Date: 7 March 2011

Author's response to reviews: see over
We have revised our paper in accordance with the reviewers’ comments. We appreciate their observations. We provide, point by point, our replies to the comments made by the reviewers, and explain how we have dealt with them in the paper. We have tracked all changes and additions in the new version of the manuscript.

**Reviewer:** Ramona Mateos-Campos

**Reviewer’s report:**

The aim of this work is clearly defined.  
The method is appropriate and well described.  
The discussion and conclusions are based on results.  
Express accurately the strengths and limitations of the study.  
The title and summary accurately convey what has been done and achieved in the study.  
It is well written.  

**Minor Essential Revisions**

1. In different parts of the work and in the tables is written: <= and >=  
I think it would be more correct to sets of symbols: # and #  
2. Methods (Statistical Analyses) fifth paragraph says "... Altman and Bland" and should be "... Bland and Altman", according to the citation.  
3. Results, paragraph eight, says "... to Altman and Bland" and should read "... Bland and Altman", according to the citation  
4. - Figure 1, the title says "... Altman and Bland" and should be "... Bland and Altman", according to the citation  
5. The bibliographic reference number 13. You should write: Bowman RL, De Lucia JL

We thank the reviewer for her comments. They have improved the manuscript. We have taken into account all the minor essential revisions in the new version of the manuscript.

**Reviewer:** Zubair Kabir

**Reviewer’s report:**

Dr Maira and her colleagues have undertaken an interesting piece of original research work based on a unique representative cohort of vegetarians in the United States, namely, the Adventist cohort. 
The authors have posed the research question in a well-defined manner. 
The methodological approach to answer the research question is appropriate and well described. 
The data analysed are sound, with inherent limitations. 
The discussion is well balanced and the conclusions drawn are data-driven. 
The bibliography is up-to-date.
The authors have spelled out one of the important study limitations, namely, the time-lag but needs further elaboration.
The title and abstract accurately convey the underlying message of the study findings.
The work is acceptable and novel in certain aspects.
Major Compulsory Revisions: None
Minor Essential Revisions: A few typos and a broader description of study limitations
Discretionary Revisions: None

We thank the reviewer for his comments. We have clarified and completed the potential limitation of time lag between self-reported and measured data in the Discussion section of the new version of the manuscript.