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Title: Impact of today’s media on university student’s body image in Pakistan; a conservative, developing country’s perspective.

Version: 1

Date: 6th December 2010

Dear Editors,

Please find our responses to the two reviews below. We have revised the manuscript according to the comments. The manuscript has also been conformed according to the journal style.

We hope this manuscript is now acceptable for your journal. Please let us know if you need any further revisions.

Regards,

Amad N Khan.

(Corresponding author)
Reviewer: Maria Inês Varela-Silva

Thank you for your comments on our paper. We have addressed all your comments and revised the manuscript accordingly. Please find below our responses to your comments.

Major compulsory revisions

Comment 1: References are not very new. Only one from 2009 and none from 2010. Most are 5 or more years old. I suggested references should be updated and 2010 papers should be included.

Response: We have updated the references with articles from 2009 and 2010. Most of the work that has been done on the effect of the media on body image relevant to our article was from some earlier articles and hence their inclusion.

Comment 2: Paper written in non-scientific language (example, "copious literature", "slippery slope"). I would suggest a native-English speaker to go through the test with the authors.

Response: We had a native English speaker go through the article and the necessary changes have been made.

Comment 3: The authors do not mention what kind of Ethics Advisory Committee Approved the Study.

Response: This has now been added to the article.

Comment 4: Did the participants give written informed consent?

Response: Yes they did. This has now been mentioned in the methods.

Comment 5: Why is the questionnaire written in English?

Response: It is so, because English is the official language of Pakistan and is taught to all children throughout their schooling. It is also the medium of instruction and examination of all the universities we attended. This reasoning has now also been added to the text.

Comment 6: Formula for sample size calculation does not need to be in the paper.

Response: It has been removed.

Comment 7: Was the scoring system piloted and validated before used in this research?

Response: Yes, it was and this has now been mentioned in the text.

Comment 8: Did the authors do a systematic review of the literature to find out if there are other studies conducted in the country?
Response: Yes, we did a systematic review and could find no similar studies conducted in Pakistan. One study that was related (on body dysmorphic disorder amongst Pakistani medical students) was added to the discussion and references. (Taqui et al : Ref no. 46)

Comment 9: The authors should provide a summary of cultural and religious background of the country and the participants and discuss the results based on that information.

Response: This was an excellent point and we have added this to the discussion.

Comment 10: The discussion of the results does not put the results in context with other relevant literature.

Response: We have revised the discussion and hope it now puts the results in better context with the relevant literature.

Minor Essential revisions

1. References are not uniformly formatted
2. Figures do not have legends and numbers

Response: Both of these issues have been addressed.
Reviewer: Margarida Matos

Reviewer's report:

The paper aims to study a relevant and original issue, and indeed a very interesting one addressing a rather unknown population. It is thus a very promising paper.

However, I have a basic concern about "style", either regarding literature (focus and presentation) and standards of reporting (methods and results), that makes me request that the authors engage in an internal review, based on the guidelines requested by the present journal.

Furthermore, authors should include a discussion about the specificity of the sample (culture, socio-economic and educational bias; gender differences) because this is probably the very interesting part of the study.

A special concern on how to include tables, how to present tables and how to present statistics (reporting chi-square e.g.)

Those are all preliminary compulsive revisions before I am able to engage in further comments.

Response:

Thank you for your very helpful comments. We have revised the text according to the guidelines provided by the present journal and hope it is more suitable for publication now.

We have taken on board your suggestion for including a discussion on our sample and think this will greatly improve our paper.

We have tried to include tables in the portrait format requested by the journal, with black line to demarcate the cells. With regards to chi-square reporting, we have included explanations for where and why it was used in the table legends and hope that this improves things.