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Editor’s comment:
The author should pay attention to the observation, made by one of the reviewers, that “the manuscript still lacks clarity overall”.

Response: We have improved the clarity of the ms throughout as suggested by the editor and one reviewer (Lahmann).

In addition to the specific points mentioned by the two reviewers, the following details should be addressed:
- row 45-51: make more clear that these sentences refer to women and men, respectively;

Response: This has been amended as suggested.

- row 53-55: avoid such a non-informative policy recommendation;

Response: The policy recommendation has been revised to be more to the point of the main result.

- row 71-88: make clear which type of studies observed relationships with parental SES. Alternatively, in the discussion section, explain why there may be a discrepancy with the results of this study;

Response: The previous studies have been better compared with the present results in the discussion.

- row 95: provide a better justification of the use of longitudinal data. Note that the causality of the cross-sectional association between adult SES and overweight is not really under dispute;

Response: The justification has been improved as suggested and discussion about cross-sectional studies abolished.

- row 219-22: avoid such speculation;
Response: The speculation has been omitted.

- row 228-236: delete or restructure this entire paragraph;

Response: The entire paragraph has been omitted.

- row 237-243: delete the first part of this paragraph, or make it a separate paragraph with a clear message;

Response: The first part is now condensed and clarified to a separate paragraph.

- row 260-262: consider presenting this result at the end of the results section

Response: We preferred to keep the results from our sensitivity analyses in the discussion. The text has been condensed and clarified.

- row 281-283: avoid such speculation;

Response: The speculation has been omitted.

- row 295-296: provide more detail to support the suggestion that there is no main bias

Response: The suggestion that there is no main bias has been abolished.

- row 306: idem

Response: The assessment of non-response has been clarified and amended to avoid too strong arguments.

- row 308-309: idem

Response: Too strong arguments have been abolished.

- row 313-319: can be omitted, because of lack of relevance

Response: The text has been omitted as suggested.

- row 322-323: avoid the qualification of 'weak' and 'non-existent' as the power of the study is too weak to support this claim.

Response: The text now avoids qualifications of 'weak' and 'non-existent'.

- row 326-327: see row 53-55

Response: The policy recommendation has been revised to be more to the point of the main result.
Reviewer's report
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Reviewer's report:
Thank you for the changes to the manuscript. Only minor issues remain.

Minor essential revisions
methods:
1. state which version of SPSS was used.

Response: “Version 15.0” has been added to the text.

2. in the results section you have repeatedly used the term "gained weight at least 5kg" which is not good grammar. all you need to say is 'gained 5kg' (or if you really want to put the word weight, say’ gained 5kg in weight'.

Response: The weight gain terminology has been revised as suggested.

3. you need to add 'kg' after reporting the change in weight in lines 168 abd 173.

Response: The unit kg has been added as suggested.

4. You need to go through and fix typographical and formatting errors that have arisen as a result of using track changes and making edits to the document.

Response: The text has been edited throughout and all errors have been corrected.

discretionary
1. i still think the discussion, while better, is overly long.

Response: The discussion has been tightened and several paragraphs have been cut.

2. would cut sentence on line 223.

Response: The sentence has been omitted as suggested.

3. Table 1 would be more interesting presented graphically

Response: We preferred table format which gives concrete basic figures for the reader.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
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.
Declaration of competing interests:
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Reviewer's report
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Version: 3 Date: 9 December 2012
Reviewer: Petra H Lahmann

Reviewer's report:
Despite the fact that the authors addressed some of the relevant issues raised earlier, the manuscript still lacks clarity overall and appropriate labelling and formatting of tables. The improvements are not obvious from the text, i.e. not made visible to the reader. It is strongly recommended that the authors employ a native speaker to improve the English writing. The manuscript would also benefit from extensive editing, thus facilitating the understanding of context.

Response: The ms text and tables have been edited throughout to be clearer. The language has been improved and a professional native English speaker has checked the language.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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