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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1. Discussion: Provide interpretation and a discussion of potential bias based on the analysis of the missing data (numerous differences in baseline characteristics). How might this affect the results?

Minor Essential Revisions:

1. Background, paragraph 4: I am confused by the last sentence. Please re-write to define "it" and remove the words "experience with." Also provide a reference.

2. Background: Define/describe KINDL, for readers unfamiliar with this scale.

3. Methods, paragraph 1: Define what is meant by "positive results." Does this mean weight loss was achieved, or a proportion of students moved from obesity to overweight or normal weight? Or something else?

4. Methods, Health and HRQoL paragraph: Replace "should indicate" with "indicated."

5. Results, paragraph 1: Replace "less" with "fewer" in the sentence "BMI, BMI percentile, ... no underweight and FEWER normal weight."

6. Tables 1 and 2: Provide p values to indicate statistically significant differences by WHtR status.

7. Table 3: Add one sentence to the Odds Ratios paragraph in the Results section to interpret the ORs in this table (for significance and direction of association).

8. Discussion, paragraph 1: Lead the discussion with a summary and interpretation of the results of this study.

9. Discussion, paragraph 3: Provide references for the discrimination towards belly fat indicated in the third sentence. Also provide a reference for the final sentence in regards to central obesity interfering with physical activity.

10. Discussion: When discussing results, all verbs should be in past tense.
11. Discussion, paragraph 4: Provide further description of ref 44 regarding the relationship between physical activity and health. This entire paragraph needs more coherence and better transitioning. It reads as a list of findings rather than a coherent thought.

12. Discussion, paragraph 5: The fourth sentence does not make sense and may be missing verbs or other words.

13. Discussion, paragraph 6: This paragraph contains no references and appears to be the authors’ opinions. Please provide citations to justify the interpretation of the results.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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