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Dear Prof Siziya

Thank you for the opportunity to resubmit the manuscript entitled ‘Modifiable risk factors for overweight and obesity in children and adolescents from São Paulo, Brazil’ (MS: 2021116952472737). We have highlighted all changes made to the original resubmission.

Please find below the point-by-point responses to the comments of the reviewers. Again, we would like to express our gratitude for the thoughtful and constructive commentary provided by the reviewers and the Associate Editor.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if there are any questions or concerns regarding this resubmission.

Kind regards

Dr Scott Duncan
Associate Director
Centre for Physical Activity and Nutrition
Auckland University of Technology
Private Bag 92006
Auckland, New Zealand
Phone: +649-921-9999 ext 7678
Fax: +649-921-9746
E-mail: scott.duncan@aut.ac.nz

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Associate Editor</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please add the following sentence to the Limitation section: &quot;The questionnaire was only cognitive adaptive and not validated either for the dietary part and the sedentary activity is self reported.&quot;</td>
<td>We have added this sentence (slightly rephrased to align with previous sentences) to the limitations section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer #1</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Page 6, line 18: The authors should define what they mean by the phrase “The sample was selected to ensure similar numbers of children at each sex and age”. Did they use a stratified sampling scheme or another sampling scheme? If so, was this implemented in their statistical analysis?</td>
<td>Actually, we used simple random sampling, which, by default, resulted in similar numbers of children at each sex and age. We realise the sentence as currently written sounds misleading and we have removed it from the methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Page 8, line 1-3: In their response about the reliability and the validity of their questionnaire the authors state that the pilot study was undertaken solely to provide acceptability and feasibility for the main study. Their main exposures (diet/sedentary behavior) are self-reported using the same questionnaire for a large age span (from 7 to 18 years old). Report of physical activity and dietary patterns are suffer from recall and report bias especially in younger ages (7-10 years old). Authors should</td>
<td>These are valid points. We have added the requested sentence in the limitations in addition to a sentence that discusses the potential presence of recall bias in younger children.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
provide more arguments about their data quality especially in younger ages (< 14 years) with the relevant references. Moreover, in the limitations of the study it should be stated that the questionnaires is only cognitive adaptive and not validated either for the dietary part and the sedentary activity is self reported.

3) Finally I suggest that the prevalence of the children with very low weight should be added in the manuscript because it provides the reader with a full picture of the categorization of the children in Brazil accordingly to their body weight status.

We have included these data in the results.

Reviewer #2

I reviewed the authors’ response and they made all the changes I placed in my initial report. Thank you.