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Reviewer's report:

General

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

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

Abstract

Background
End of 1st sentence should read: "...parents cannot be relied upon to accurately report their own heights."

Results
There are slight discrepancies between the figures given in the Abstract, Results and Fig 2, as follows:
Fathers who reported Ht within 2cm is 50% in Abstract and Fig 2 but 51% in Results; mothers who reported Ht within 2cm is 57% in Abstract, 59% in Results and 58% in Fig 2. Also, Fathers who were inaccurate by >4cm is 16% in Abstract but 15% according to Fig 2. Mean measured maternal height is reported as 160.7 cm in Abstract but 160.6 cm in Results. Effect on mean MPTH (165.3 vs 165.7 cm) is reported as 0.6 cm in Abstract, but is 0.4 cm according to results. Please ensure that all data are consistent.

Conclusions
Last sentence should read: "When a child's growth is in question...obtained."

Methods
Fourth sentence should read:
"Measurements were made by two investigators (AHL and TAW) whose techniques were compared."

Results - Mothers
Remove "which was (p=NS)" from end of last sentence, as this has already been stated.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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