Minor essential revisions
1. Overall comment: This paper is well written and was a pleasure to read. The background section concisely outlines the relevant literature and provides a clear rationale for the study. The method is generally well detailed. My comments relate to making the methods and results sections clearer.
2. Abstract: Results: Line 1: “was the higher BMI” - ? At baseline? F’up? or Both? please clarify.
3. Background: page 4: Line 5: “sedentariness”– is this a word?! 
4. Methods: Sample: page 5: Line 1: you mostly use the term “neighbourhoods” but then switch to (line 6) “suburb” – I suggest you stick to the one term.
5. Methods: Sample: page 5: Line 6: fix wording- suggest reword to “all those who were eligible were invited to participate’.
6b. how did you get their mobile phone contact details – you just had electoral roll.
7. Methods: Sample: page 5: Line 19: word missing "denoted “as" females...
8. Methods: Sample: page 6: Line 2: did they consent to follow up at the time of completing their baseline survey? if so, please specify.
10. Methods: Weight and BMI: Page 6: Line 3: “as not overweight/obese (15.79 – 24.99kg m-2)”– This is not WHO terminology as per the reference, nor is it one recognised category.
11. Methods: Weight and BMI: Page 6: Line 5 “the underweight category” – not specified. But should be <18.5kg m-2. this section on BMI needs reworking.
12. Measures: Dietary Intake: Page 7: (overall) You haven’t measured dietary intake, you have actually measured food habits. Edit terminology throughout.
14. Measures: Dietary Intake: Page 7: (overall) So they completed the entire FFQ
but you only analysed 6 food items? The FFQ tool has not been validated to be dissected in this way and this should be noted in the limitations.

15. Results: Page 10: bottom line: 'stress was not predictive of being “in the overweight “(insert) BMI category, but” higher stress levels (remove ‘however’ and join sentences.)

17. Results: Page 11: Line 10: p=0.011) add to the end of the sentence, “but there were no other dietary associations.”

18. Discussion: Page 11: Line 6 of discussion section: “overweight or obese” – Be careful not to imply a longitudinal relationship with overweight.

19. Discussion: Page 12: Line 26: “the present study,...measures of dietary intake.” This is likely to be due to the limitations in your tool, and you measured six food habits, not dietary intake.

20. Discussion: Page 13: Line 3: when comparing to other studies, state what methods these studies used to measure dietary intake.


22. Discussion: Page 13: Line 19: Indeed. The longitudinal analysis was based on just over 10% of your original sample. you should discuss what this bias may mean for your results.

23. Discussion: Page 13: Line 26: I suggest adding a comment to the end along the lines of "Particularly, the role of PA in reducing stress (and weight) could be emphasised in specifically targeted programs'.

24. Discussion: In the introduction, you raised the issue of direction of causality in the stress-obesity relationship. But as far as I can tell, you only examined stress as a predictor of an obesity outcome, not the reverse. Perhaps justify that decision to test in that direction more strongly in your aim.

25. Ref no. 18 appears to have an error in the 4th author
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