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Dear Hans

Re

MS: 6704706011721901
Obesity and Clinical Obesity. Men's understandings of obesity and its relation to the risk of diabetes: a qualitative study
Nicola F Weaver, Louise Hayes, Madeleine J Murtagh and Nigel C Unwin

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to respond to the reviewers comments. I have described the action taken in response to the comments point by point below

Reviewer: Margaret Stone

Major compulsory revisions

1. In response to comments made we have reworded the description of the analysis and presented the findings in the way suggested – describing views and perspectives, rather than describing the findings as ‘stories’.

2. We took note of concerns about length and have been able to cut more than 2000 words without compromising the content

Minor essential revisions

Differently to changed to differently from.

Minor essential revisions:

1. We have removed the comments giving the number of interviewees with knee problems as this is correctly pointed out to be inappropriate

2. We have acknowledged with a reference the connection between central obesity and the literature on waist circumference measurement (third paragraph discussion)

3. In the discussion we have expanded the discussion about validity and generalisability of qualitative research findings to address the comment made about our observation of a potential ‘window of opportunity’ to intervene in the group studied.

Reviewer: Mary Flynn

Major compulsory revisions

The results have been amended to include the number of letters sent out.

The method section has been amended to include a statement that no incentives were offered to men to participate in the study.

The discussion section second paragraph has been expanded to include more discussion about the place of, and limitations of, qualitative research data with reference to validity and generalisability.

Discretionary revisions

A reference to the content of the Wanless 2007 report was already present in the introduction but this has been made clearer.

The N has been added to the abstract results
I hope we have been able to satisfy all your requirements. If you have any further requests please let me know

Yours sincerely

Nicola Weaver