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**Reviewer's report:**

Major compulsory revisions

1. The title would be clearer if it talked about obesity prevalence than obesity burden.

2. I would do something simple with the self-report data. P 8, second paragraph: It might be good to note the findings for studies with self-reported body size measures. They aren’t that bad and would give some more recent idea of prevalence in some areas (ref 16,17 and several others). You comment later that you felt that you improved precision, but you seem to be lacking comprehensiveness. You could do a separate table for self report vs measured body size and comment on the difference. I think they will be rather similar. Rather than solely commenting on the well-known overestimation of height in men and underestimation of weight in both genders (especially women), you could simply say that the self-report is probably optimistic.

3. I think that some note needs to be made of apparent changes over time.

4. Further simplification, especially Discussion reduction, would make the paper more useful. You should emphasize that not getting obese should be the primary recommendation, rather than weight loss.

**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:** Acceptable

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