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Brandheim S, Rantakeisu U, Starrin B
“BMI and psychological distress in 68,000 Swedish adults: A weak association when controlling for an age-gender combination.”

Dear editor

The reviewers’ comments were of great value for this article and we are truly thankful for the improvements we were able to make from these comments.

Changes made from reviewers’ suggestions:

Reviewer 1:
We have justified why no approval of an ethics committee was needed. Changes can be viewed at page 4 paragraph 2.

In fact we chose to follow Puustinen et al. and changed the concept "mental ill-health" to the concept "psychological distress" throughout the entire text as it seemed more in line with our intentions with the study.

Reviewer 2:
We have balanced the content in the Introduction and the Discussion.

There is now a clear Conclusion section, following the Discussion section

We have corrected the language on several accounts

We have changed the title in order to give the answer to the main question

The Discussion now starts with the main results of the study

A possible hypothesis, explaining our results is added to the Discussion

In the Result section in the abstract we have added some numerical data (not however p values but percentages

The use of GHQ-12 has been further explained in the method section

Abbreviations are checked

The tables and figures are changed. Now they display ‘psychological distress’, more explicit p values as well as Confidence Intervals. Comes are changed by points. However, we do find it suitable with color-figures, as we find them easier on the eye.
We have highlighted the strength of the study (its large sample size) after the Limitations section

*The editor:*
In Table 2, 95% CIs have been added as well as specific p values for statistical significance

Due to changes we have added the following references: Carr et al, 2008; McElroy et al, 2004; Puustinen et al, 2011; Stafford et al, 2011; Wheaton, 2007.

Due to changes we have also revised the conclusion section in the abstract

Hopefully
*Susanne*