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Reviewer’s report:

The authors clearly have attempted to address my concerns, and they have done so in a comprehensive way. This paper, in my opinion, does now make a contribution to the field.

However, I have some concerns, which can and should be addressed.

Major Compulsory Revisions

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. Refs:


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.

Minor Essential Revisions

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 …”

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.

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.

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.

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

“Basic variables” is named on Page 8. The word “basic” should be removed.

Page 8 states … “easy English”. What is easy English? Perhaps use the term
“plain” English.

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%).”

The new analysis, including the new analysis comparing private/public sector
universities deserves more attention in the discussion, discussing plausible
explanations for the findings.

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.”

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

**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.