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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: 3

Date: 19th April 2011

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: Margarida Matos

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.

Comment 1: A rather vague style must be clear up ( ex I would cut the first paragraph...too vague too non scientific and useless for the rest of the argument)

Response: The first paragraph has been duly removed and non-scientific language omitted.

Comment 2: Qui-squares must be avaliable, not the "p values", I mean the value for the qui-square itself

Response: The chi-sqaure values have been added to the results and respective tables.

Comment 3: In the discussion, authors have to limit the results to significant effects in a statistic sense

Response: Keeping this in mind, changes to the discussion have been made.

Comment 4: Authors have to discuss results that go against the regular literature, e.g. by means of addressing cultural differences. Those have to be addressed in a scientific maner, preferably throught the use and contrast with previous published papers.

Response: To this end, a table highlighting body image issues within different populations has been added. We feel this is an effective way of comparing and contrasting our study with previous papers.
Reviewer: Ana Luísa Pereira

Reviewers Report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? 
The question is well defined. The reader understands which is the problem developed and the goals of the authors.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? 
The methods used allow the authors to gather a very good sample and relevant data.

3. Are the data sound? 
The data is very interesting and well described.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? The paper corresponds to the standards of publication in what concerns its reporting and deposition.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? 
The authors had made great efforts to respond the comments of the previous revision and the discussion and conclusions had gained with this work. Thus, the paper is enhanced in its quality.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? 
The authors provide the information of the limitations, which is something that can be useful for other researchers.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? 
The authors do not provide that information in a clearly form, but this does not have repercussions upon the paper under evaluation.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? 
The title and abstract are objective in their information.

9. Is the writing acceptable? 
The reviewer has the opinion that the writing is acceptable.
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

The references should be corrected regarding its format.

Response:

Thank you for your comments. We appreciate your support. We have taken on board your suggestions and have corrected any faults in the format of the references.
Reviewer: Kaushik Bose

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.

Comment 1: The title: Please replace semi-colon with colon after Pakistan

Response: Done.

Comments 2 & 3: Tables 3 and 4; the chi-squares are not clear. Accordingly, please change in the text.

Tables 1 and 2; please insert chi-square values. Accordingly insert at the appropriate place in the text.

Response: Done.