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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors,

Thank you for including some of the previous suggestions. I believe that your paper has now addressed some of its major weaknesses. Nevertheless, I believe it still has some aspects that should be emphasized in order to give the non-experienced readers the opportunity to make their own judgments regarding the advancements and limitations of your paper. Please do correct the following major compulsory revisions:

- First sentence of the discussion section: Please replace the word "contributing" with "associated" or similar. Your work cannot prove causality. Is an important concept that must be highlighted.

- Last paragraph of discussion section: I believe that you cannot state that "(...) the advantages of using (...) outweigh the drawback of non-random approaches and provides for robust findings that are generalizable". You can still support this statement, but with data. That is why I asked you to comment on the characteristics of the reference population (your universe) and the similarities or difference with your sample (included patients). I know this is very difficult. I am not asking you to do this if you do not have such information. But if you cannot make any comparison, please do not state that you have robust findings that are generalizable. Acknowledging that your results should not be generalized (at least straightforwardly) will actually improve the quality of your paper.

- In addition, you must include in other weaknesses the study design (post-hoc retrospective analysis of a prospective cohort). Also that there are possibly many other confounders not assessed (that could change the associations found).

- In the same line, it is preferable that in the conclusions you use the word "suggest" instead of "confirm".

- Please make sure that the abstract reflects these observations.

Minor essential revisions:

Since you report few data, I think that showing results of adjustment by age and years of education (together with weight misperception in a multivariate analysis) would be interesting.

Best wishes,

GP
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