Reviewer's report

Title: Changes in abdominal obesity in university students stratified by Body Mass Index Changes in body fat in university students

Version: 4
Date: 9 September 2015

Reviewer: Pilar De Miguel-Etayo

Reviewer's report:

Please number your comments and divide them into

- 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.

General comments:
International nomenclature should be mandatory.
All abbreviations should be listed and explained at the first time.

Material and Methods: Some additional revisions should be necessary.
The sentence highlight in yellow should be indicated in the results section.
(page 5): line 6-19.
The paragraphs related to anthropometric measures should be revised. Please see the attachment.
(pages 8-9): line 20-23+1-6.
The paragraph related to statistical analysis should be revised. Please see the attachment.

Results: In general the results have been improved in their explanation, although more detailed explanations should be mentioned in the manuscript. The exact p values should be mentioned in the text and indicate in the tables and figures as “a or b or **” according to legends (p<0.05).
(page 4): line 14-16.
The sentence highlight in yellow should be indicated in the sample description in material and methods section.
Discussion: In general the discussion section has been improved in their comparisons, although a language revision should be mandatory. On the other hand good suggestions were observed in the discussion section.

I think these sentences have the same information.

(page 9): line 15-17.
Please, indicate the reliability results obtained in the Reliability study and the corresponding reference.

Table 2: Has been studied the statistical differences in the obesity prevalence (BMI categories) between 2007, 2010 and 2013? If has not studied, please, add this information

- 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
Abstract (page 2): line 12
Introduction: (page 3): lines 8, 13
Methods: please revise major comments
Results: (page 6): Lines 9, 12, 18, 19, 23 / (page 7): 6, 7, 10
Discussion: (page 7): lines 18, 20 / (page 8): 9, 15, 16, 18 / (page 9): 1-3, 9
Table 2: F values: This information it’s important to the researcher, in order to apply a post hoc tests...therefore should be deleted.
Table 3: Clearer distribution it’s necessary (please see the previous suggestions)

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
Table 1 and table 2: minor comments has been indicated in the attachment

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

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

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