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Author's response to reviews: see over
Reviewer 1

Minor changes

- Throughout the text change the use of ‘females’ and ‘males’ to ‘men’ and ‘women’

Results

- Page 6 line 5, replace ‘done’ with the word ‘performed’
- Page 6, last line and top of page 7: detail the significance with each appropriate factors rather than in a list of p-values at the end of a sentence this will make the results easier to follow.
- Page 7 line 11: the p values should be aligned with each element rather than at the end of the sentence
- Page 7: line 11 and line 12: keep format of how ‘p-value’, or p-value is written uniform throughout paper.

Response: We thank the reviewer for his insightful comments. All minor changes were done accordingly and were tracked to facilitate the editor.

Reviewer 2

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. In “methods” section, authors should give more detailed description on sampling procedure. It is not clear whether the study was conducted among students from one university or more in Riyadh.

We thank the reviewer for this comment. A more detailed explanation was provided in the revised methods (page 4).

2. Many public health professionals might not be familiar with the indices provided by Body Fat analyser, BMR, AMC, BCM etc. It would be useful for readers if authors could provide some brief information on these indices.

This comment is very insightful and a brief information has been added in the anthropometrics section of the revised methods with respect to body fat analyser.

3. In “statistical analysis” section, there is no information about correlation analysis, but table 4 provides results on correlations between perceived stress and independent variables. In addition, in “results” section authors mention there were significant and positive association between stress level and percent body fat. Interpretation of correlations are more meaningful if magnitude of correlation coefficient is also provided. According to Cohen, correlation coefficients in the order of 0.10 are “small,” those of 0.30 are “medium,” and 0.50 are “large” in terms of magnitude of effect sizes. Interpreting the correlation results adding effects sizes would be more useful for readers.
The statistical analysis part has been modified accordingly to include correlation analyses. Results section part has also been revised to include magnitude of associations elicited between perceived stress score and clinical parameters measured.

Minor revisions

1. In Table 1, positioning of the first row and other rows in first column should be corrected.

2. In “methods” section-“anthropometrics” subsection, it would be better to give classification of obesity based on Body Mass Index in detail; such as individuals with BMI>30 kg/m2 was classified as obese...

3. In “methods” section-“anthropometrics” subsection, abbreviation “BRP” is first time used; it should be defined.

4. In page 6, “results section”, first paragraph, according to text participants with high perceived stress levels had lower HDL-cholesterol levels. However the finding in the Table 2 is the opposite. Finding in the table or the interpretation in the text should be corrected.

5. All first time used abbreviations in first paragraph of results section (BMR, AMC, BCM) should be defined.

6. Only the strengths of the study was provided in the discussion section. It would be better if authors could mention some of the limitations of this study. I believe; even the study has a big sample size, if it was conducted in one university, findings cannot be generalized for the entire population and this might be a limitation instead of strength of the study.

Response: All the minor revisions have been addressed accordingly and were tracked to better facilitate the editor.