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Reviewer's report:

This is a revision and resubmission of a paper by Dr. Mond and colleagues. The paper aims to explicate quality of life impairment associated with body dissatisfaction. As mentioned in my earlier review, this appears to be a well-powered, nationally representative, and incorporates items from a well-validated measure of body dissatisfaction. The question posed by the authors is well-defined and of clear importance to the field of eating disorders.

I have no further minor or discretionary revisions at this time. However, I do have one major compulsory revision based on my earlier review of this manuscript:

The authors acknowledged that their use of logistic regression for ordinal data is not appropriate (given the nature of the data), yet they chose not to use ordered probit or ordered logit regression (which is the correct regression statistic for ordinal data). A concern is that collapsing data into dichotomies results in a loss of information. The authors’ rationale for continuing to use logistic regression was that “we were interested in the prevalence and relative likelihood of responses indicating poor quality of life for participants reporting different levels of body dissatisfaction.” It would be useful if the authors could clarify how this specifically warrants the use of a dichotomous approach vs. an ordinal approach. I recommend that the authors not use the rationale that “the use of ordinal logistic regression would have made interpretation of the results in this regard unduly complicated,” because the complexity of the analysis is not a strong rationale for using (or not using) a statistical approach. I would recommend using a statistical approach that is appropriate to the research question and data. If there are strong, clear conceptual reasons for analyzing these data as dichotomous, that would be useful to state.

The Discussion was well-balanced and adequately supported by the data. The authors addressed this reviewer’s feedback appropriately and fully in this section and I have no further suggestions for the Discussion section.

Overall, the topic of this manuscript is interesting and addresses an issue of public health importance. The sample was particularly strong and the study utilized a well-validated measure of body dissatisfaction. I appreciate the opportunity to read and review this revised manuscript.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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