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Reviewer's report:

General

This is an interesting article on the prevalence of obesity in Cameroon. The sampling frame is adequate and the authors have collected considerable data that substantiates their statements. This paper could be published provided several revisions are performed.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

In several places there is a duplication of the information. For instance, the last paragraph of page 6 replicates almost all information from figure 2; there is no need for such thing.

Some of the correlations indicated in figure 1 (which is actually a table) are expectable: since BMI is the ratio between weight and height, than it is expected that BMI will correlate with weight. The authors should focus only on some relationships (for instance between BMI and WHR), not on the whole of the relationships. Hence, the text (last paragraph of page 5, discussion) should be rewritten accordingly.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

It is unclear to the reviewer how the ORs were calculated. The reviewer presumes it was using logistic regression, but this should be clarified.

In the abstract, please define the abbreviations (WHR, WC).

Page 2, last line: please check out the citations formats; also, the citations should be written before the period, not after.

Page 3: is this the correct place for keywords? Shouldn’t they be put immediately after the abstract?

Number format should be corrected: it might be wise to use a comma to separate thousands (page 3).

Page 3, third line before the end: delete â€œ10011â€, as it is already stated in full letters.

Page 4, the authors indicate that three categories of BMI were identified, the first one being based on the range 20 â€“ 25 kg/m2. But afterwards normal weight is defined as a BMI < 25 kg/m2. Does this mean that no subject had a BMI <20 kg/m2? Also, it would be interesting to see whether obesity is now more prevalent than underweight (BMI<18 kg/m2).

Page 5, results. It is stated at the end of the first paragraph “data not shown”. Actually, the data was shown before!

Page 6, line 6: a p<0.00 means that p is less than zero and thus is negative, which is impossible. It should state p<0.001

The discussion is difficult to read, as the authors shift between BMI-defined, WHR-defined, WC-defined prevalence of obesity plus all the relationships between anthropometric variables. It might have been better to provide first the prevalence of BMI-defined overweight and obesity (as this is still the standard) plus the results of the other anthropometric variables according to BMI category. Then the prevalence of obesity according to other criteria could be discussed.

Table 2: please round percentages

Table 3: if the subjects were selected by having a WHR < or > to 0.85, how come that the average WHR for
subjects with WHR > 0.85 is 0.8? Please check number of decimals. Also a SE of zero for WHR is somewhat puzzling; it might better be 0.1 or 0.01.

References: some journal abbreviations have periods (refs. 6, 14), others not (refs. 3, 7); please format according to the journal’s instructions.
Reference 2: the original title should be indicated (in French).

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

**What next?:** Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No
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