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Reviewer's report:

- Major Compulsory Revisions
The author must respond to these before a decision on publication can be reached. For example, additional necessary experiments or controls, statistical mistakes, errors in interpretation.

Results: In general, more detailed explanations should be mentioned.
Discussion: In general, more detailed comparisons should be mandatory. On the other hand good suggestions were observed in the discussion section.

(page 7): line 19.
The sentence “The increase for males was 2.8-4.1 cm, and in females it was between 2.7-5.9 cm” should be indicated in the results section. Additionally, the changes should be shown as mean±SD and their significance

(page 7): line 20.
The first sentence, “These findings are not only concerning for the sample of university students in Talca but also for the university populations throughout the other regions of Chile” need a rate comparisons and a reference to state this information.

(page 8): line 7.
The sentence “As illustrated in Table 3” should be indicated in the results section, not in the discussion section. Moreover, there are not comparisons between other similar studies

(page 10): line 1.
The statement mentioned was unnecessary; WC is your abdominal obesity outcome.

- Minor Essential Revisions
The author can be trusted to make these. For example, missing labels on figures, the wrong use of a term, spelling mistakes.

Please, see in the manuscript file some comments regarding missing labels on tables and figure, the wrong use of some term.

Some minor essential revisions are marked thought the manuscript
Introduction: (page 3): lines 19, 20
Methods: (page 5): Lines 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 23 / (page 6): Lines 5, 6
Results: (page 6): Lines 9, 17, 18, 20 / (page 7): line 4
Discussion: (page 7): lines 16, 17, 18 / (page 9): 1, 14, 17, 18

Table 1 and 3: Clearer distribution it’s necessary (please see the suggestions documents in the attachment)

Legend table 1, 2, 3: Please, see some comments in the manuscript
Legend figure: Please, see some comments in the manuscript

- Discretionary Revisions
These are recommendations for improvement which the author can choose to ignore. For example clarifications, data that would be useful but not essential.

Some discretionary revisions are marked thought the manuscript

Introduction: (page 3): Lines 12, 13, 14 / (page 4): lines 2, 3, 4
Methods: (page 4): Line 21 / (page 5): line 16 / (page 6): line 2
Results: (page 6): lines 11, 16, 22 / (page 7): lines 5, 6
Discussion: (page 7): line 14 / (page 8): line 22 / (page 9): line 2
List of abbreviations: (page 10): line 6

Table 2 and 3: Please, see some comments in the manuscript.

Figure 1: The same figure was uploading twice. Please, delete one.

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

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

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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