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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions

The work is interesting and publishable in BMC Sports Science, Medicine and Rehabilitation but some changes need to be made before its publication. The work is fairly well written, but in my opinion, the analysis of "the feasibility" should be treated in Subjects and/or Procedures, the "core" of the study should be focused on "the effectiveness of the programs". Please restructure the article with this in mind.

1. Title. Please, substitute "in obese adults ..." by "... adults with abdominal obesity ..."

2. Abstract. The data analysis must be mentioned. Please add it.


4. Page 7. When comparing two physical exercise programs, they should be performed with methods as similar as possible. I am concerned that the "walking" group did not have any supervision by the investigators and did not use heart rate monitors, whereas the "boxing" group did. This might explain the reason for the differences. This could be an important factor to take into account.


6. Methods. Was the study approved by the ethics committee of any institution? Please clarify.

7. Page 14. Last paragraph. "... significantly reduces ..." This is a redundancy, if it was not significant one could not talk about reduction. Please remove "significantly" and revise all the text with this in mind.

8. Page 15. Paragraph 2. The whole paragraph is a repetition of the results. Please summarize the most relevant results and, especially, contrast them with other studies. Review all the Discussion Section with this in mind.

9. Was there any control of the physical activity performed by the subjects? If there was not, it can not be guaranteed that the effects of the "boxing" program were due to the program itself, and not a hypothetical increase in physical activity
done freely.

10. I recommend the inclusion of the limitations of the study before the conclusions.

11. Table 2. If the Effect Size is calculated it makes no sense to calculate the percentage of change -- the magnitude of the change is marked by the ES. Please remove this column in Table 2. Also, there being differences in some cases in favour of "week 0" and in others in favour of "week 16" it is not possible that the ES is always positive. Please revise.

**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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