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Reviewer's report:

1. In Table 1, the description is not necessary in the column itself, they can be given as footnotes also. How were the variables expressed? Mean SD or Mean SE?

2. The values in all the tables it is difficult to read and they can be given up to one decimal.

3. In Table 2 & 3, what were the variables were significant between normal's and MetS group for each age group. Kindly mention the significance as symbols. These two tables can be made into one and given as men and women as normal's and MetS instead of splitting them according to different age groups and its very difficult to interpret. IF the authors want to include these tables, they can give it as Supplementary tables.

4. From Table 4 to 8, the p values should be given after OR and CI. Also too many variables and values are difficult to interpret.

5. In Figures, the data table, grid lines, percentage symbols can be removed, which will make the figure more presentable and neat. The titles for x and y axis can be given.

6. In methods section, definitions or the detailed procedures of the eight circumferences measurements were made should be given.

7. Why only age, region and education were adjusted, any specific reason for adjusting these variables? Also the subjects were already split into different age groups and why age was adjusted to find the association between MetS and Anthropometric indices.

8. The aim of the study and the title should match, as of now the title doesn't read well.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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