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Object: MS: 6044656239046596- Weight misperception amongst youth of a developing country: Pakistan -A Cross-sectional study. Muhammad Danish Saleem et al.

Thank you for consideration of our manuscript. We also appreciate the reviewer’s meticulous review of our work every time. We have made the changes as per reviewer’s comments.

Reviewer #1: StephaHine Helmer

Major Revisions:

Abstract:

1) P.2, Results: ‘Greatest misperception of was observed’. It appears that there is a word missing to complete the sentence. Please add the necessary information.
   • Done

2) P.2, Results: ‘Females overestimated 8 times more than males.’ In the previous sentence you are referring to underweight female. In the mentioned sentence you are reporting results about the overall sample. Please specify the referring sub-group of the sample in each sentence.
   • Done

Background:

3) P.4, 1st paragraph, last three sentences: Please provide a citation for the theory of weight misperception.
   • Citation provided

Methods:

4) P. 7/8, Data collection tool: Please explain what you mean with ‘Basic variables’.
   • The term basic has been removed.

5) P.9, Statistical analysis: Please provide more information about binary logistic regression. Did you perform more than one regression? If yes, why? Why didn’t you mention the independent variable sex in table 3?
   • We performed two logistic regression models. One using misperception and the other using type of misperception. As misperception is the main variable in our study we included the findings in table3. The findings of regression with types of
misperception have been mentioned in the text where relevant. As gender (sex) was not statistically significant it was not included in table 3.

- Additional information has been added to the analysis paragraph.

Results:
6) P. 11, Figure 1: The description of figure 1 in the text is very good. I would like to read this detailed explanation in the heading of the figure (attachment). In the attachment it is not totally clear that the distribution of misperceptions between BMI groups is shown.

- Done

Discussion:
7) P.17, Limitations: The BMI has further limitations. Because it is not a measure of body fatness, very muscular individuals often fall into the overweight category when they are not overly fat. Therefore, it could be possible that the BMI is not appropriate for i.e. muscular males who ‘misperceived’ themselves as normal weight. I would like to read about this issue in the limitations chapter.

- This point has been added to the limitations.

Minor Essential Revisions:

Abstract:
1) P.2, Methods: Please add ‘statistically’ to the last sentence.

- Done

2) P.2, Results: ‘Underweight females overestimated their weight (…) males underestimated their weights’. Please replace weights by weight.

- Done

Background:

3) P.4, 1st paragraph: Please add ‘of’ to the last sentence of the first paragraph.

- Done

4) P.5, 1st paragraph: Please replace ‘Proper’ by ‘proper’.

- Done

Methods:
5) P.9, 2nd paragraph: Please add ‘statistically’ to the last sentence.

- Done

Results:
6) P. 11, Figure 2 &3: Figure 2 and 3 contain information that must not necessarily be shown in a graph or a figure. In this regard, a table that contains the merged information of Fig. 2&3 would be more appropriate.

- Figure 2 and 3 have been merged into a table. This new table is table 3. Chi square tests cannot be applied for this table hence p-values have not been quoted.
- The new table is now table 4.
7) Table 3: Page 26: The title of the table should contain more information about the content of the analysis. Please add information of the legend to the title (For example: Associations between misperception and age, type of university and faculty (results from binary logistic regression))

- Done

Discretionary Revisions:
Background:
P. 5, 2nd paragraph: In matters of uniformity: Please replace 12853 by 12,853 and 2352 by 2,352 and so on.

- Done
Reviewer #2: Dustin Duncun

Major revisions

1) Did the authors consider computing Prevalence Ratios as opposed to Odds Ratios? Are the authors concerned whether the results and interpretation of results would be influenced by choice of the parameter estimate? The latter is an empirical question that can (and should) be answered, as the outcomes aren’t rare (all >10%). When there is a relatively high prevalence of a behavior/outcome, it is well-known in epidemiology that the Odds Ratio will overestimate the effect.
   • This was not put into considerations. Since SPSS output yields odds ratio, these were reported due to same. There wasn’t any conflict for the parameter estimate by the authors.

2) Page 9 states, “T-test was used to measure differences in means for continuous variables in gender and chi square test was applied to determine association for the categorical variables with gender, misperception and types of misperception.” Gender is a categorical variable; t-tests are in appropriate for such data.
   • The t-test was used to compare means of continuous variables between males and females. This has been clarified in the methods.

Minor Essential Revisions

3) I recommend having a copy editor review the manuscript. There are a few typos. For example, last sentence of Page 7 should read “It IS comprised of the …”
   • It has been corrected.

4) In the Introduction, the purpose states to look at the effects of gender. However, the updated manuscript looks at a variety of other variables (e.g. university type), which should perhaps be mentioned in the purpose in the Introduction.
   • The additional variables have been mentioned.

5) Page 4 states, “The youth of Pakistan (age group of 15 - 24) according to the 2007 United Nations Development Program statistics form a substantial 21.8% of the total population (36 million).” Is this referring to Pakistan or the world? If the world, 21.8% seems very high.
   • The 21.8% refers to the percentage of youth in Pakistan. It has been made clear in the introduction.

6) Throughout the manuscripts, authors say “binary logistic regression”. Because logistic regression is predicated on a binary outcome, there is no need to say “binary logistic”. Use “logistic regression” only.
   • Done

7) I appreciate the authors for including p-values in tables; authors should also report the test statistic, e.g. chi-square value.
   • Done

8) “Basic variables” is named on Page 8. The word “basic” should be removed.
   • Done
9) Page 8 states … “easy English”. What is easy English? Perhaps use the term “plain” English.
   • Done

10) The first sentence of the results probably would be better served in the methods section:
    “We approached a total of 1600 students, out of which 1400 agreed to participate in the survey (response rate 87.5%).”
    • It has been moved to the methods section.

11) The new analysis, including the new analysis comparing private/public sector universities deserves more attention in the discussion, discussing plausible explanations for the findings.
    • Additions to the discussion have been made.

12) Page 16: The sentence in the “Strengths and Limitations” section should read, “The most significant achievement of this study was the OBJECTIVE calculation of the BMI of the participants.”
    • Done