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Editor,
BMC Public Health

Re: 377739403542985

Underestimation of weight and its associated factors among overweight and obese adults in Pakistan: a cross sectional study.
Seema Bhanji, Ali Khan Khuwaja, Fawad Siddiqui, Iqbal Azam and Khawar Kazmi

Dear Sir,

We wish to thank you for providing valuable comments and feedback on our manuscript.

We have incorporated all the comments and suggestions made by the reviewer and revised the manuscript. The revisions are tracked changed in red in the text. The manuscript has also been reviewed and edited specifically for English and scientific text as suggested both by the editor and the reviewer by Dr. Banalata Sen, an author aid mentor and “Editor and Education and Outreach Program Manager” of Journal “Environmental Health Perspectives”.

Hoping that the revised manuscript will now be acceptable for publication, we thank you in advance for re-considering it.

Please also find the point by point summary of the concerns attached along with this.

With thanks and best regards,

Corresponding author

Dr. Seema Bhanji
MBBS(AKU), FCPS, MCPS, Diploma in Clinical Epidemiology
Senior Instructor
Department of Family medicine,
Aga Khan University.
seema.bhanji@aku.edu

Chair, Pakistan primary Care Research Network
Reviewer 2:

1. Reviewer’s comments: “In conclusion of the manuscript, as well in the conclusion of abstract, writers refer to a non-existent country representative sample by naming their study as “a cross sectional survey of Pakistani people”. These two sentences have to be changed so that they won’t give an incorrect impression of the sample”. 

(Changed as suggested)

2. Reviewer’s comments: “I also would like to encourage the writers to edit their manuscript once again because in few parts the article doesn’t totally meet the requirements of finished scientific text. Few examples from the discussion below: Duplication: ….. avoiding jumping to conclusions”.

We have edited the manuscript to meet the requirements of finished scientific text. In addition the manuscript has also been reviewed and edited by Dr. Banalata Sen, who is Editor and Education and Outreach Program Manager of Journal “Environmental Health Perspectives”.

Minor Essential Revisions

3. Reviewer’s comments: Results: The writers claim that “the proportions of overweight/obese were similar for location of clinics, gender, and level of education”. I would like to rephrase the clause that there were no statistical differences in between the mentioned proportions according to the CIs.

(Changes incorporated as suggested)

4. References are partly missing in second to last and third to last paragraphs of the discussion; the reference number 4 deals with adults.

(References no. 35-36 have been inserted). Reference for children (no.37) has been added.

5. Discretionary Revisions
Is it according to the guidelines of the publication to use form as Gutierrez-Fisac JL when it comes to references within the manuscript? (See the instrument section). Are the initial letters of forenames necessary?

(Changed as suggested by the reviewer)

6. Table 2: I suppose that en-dash is more commonly used in 95 % confidence intervals than a comma (i.e. 1.8-6.39 instead of 1.8, 6.39)

(Changed as suggested by the reviewer)
We have edited the manuscript for quality of written English. In addition the manuscript has also been reviewed and edited by Dr. Banalata Sen, who is Editor and Education and Outreach Program Manager of Journal “Environmental Health Perspectives”.