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Reviewer's report:

The authors have answered most of the given points sufficiently and made appropriate amendments. However, I unfortunately have to go back to my earlier remark of the nature of nonprobablility convient sample. 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.

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: “In our study, not knowing their ideal weight was also associated with weight misperception. Not knowing their ideal weight will put them at higher risk of misperception as they may consider themselves to be adequate despite being overweight/obese and thus not engage in weight loss practices.”

Illogicality: “Checking weight did not improve perception in our population, as similar proportions of people who check and didn’t check their weights misperceived. This may have several explanations. Firstly for people who did check their weight if they do not know their ideal body weight, they would still misperceive.”

Unpunctuality: “The study took place in an urban setting and hence these results cannot be generalized to entire Pakistani population.”

The writers can gain more professional and stylish manuscript by paying attention to enunciation and avoiding jumping to conclusions.

Minor Essential Revisions

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.

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

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?

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)

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

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.
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