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Reviewer's report:

The major benefit of this manuscript is the unique population, i.e. Pakistan youth. While the manuscript has been improved, the authors have not address many of my previous comments (I do recognize that some have been addressed) or provide in their re-submittal comments/justification for not doing so. I don't think it's worth highlighting all comments not addressed by the authors, but for guidance sake I will provide a few of my previous comments not addressed:

-“Gender differences in weight misperception have been routinely documented in studies in the US and several other countries (as I previously mentioned). At issue here is the rudimentary analytic plan and discussion of results. The authors use chi-square statistics. Multivariate analyses (to control for confounding covariates) should be conducted.” (As an example, age and ethnicity can be controlled for in a regression framework, which were collected in the survey.)

-“No chi-square statistics or associated p-values are reported in tables; authors should do so.”

-“Authors state, “…There were more male participants than females instead of the ideal 50/50 ratio, but we solved that problem by comparing the two genders separately. This is mainly because females found the concept of the study objectionable.” in the “Strengths and Limitations” section. Did the participants know the objective of the study? If so, this could be a fatal flaw, due to participant reactivity bias etc. When specifically were the participants told of the study objective?” (Also, no N by gender is reported in the updated manuscript.)

-“The authors do a good job at describing the sample; however, authors should state the N of all the universities of Karachi. (Knowing that 6 were selected in insufficient.) How many are there in total?” (This is crucial information to know; while the authors have been more transparent and clearer about the sampling design, and address some of these comments, much is still unclear. For example, of the 6 universities, how were people obtained to be sampled? Was everyone at the university sampled? [I assume not, given the last sentence in the “Study Design” section.])
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**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being
published
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