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Reviewer's report:

This paper describes weight recording patterns within the CPRD database (UK primary care). On the whole it is a well written and conducted analysis, which achieves its stated aims. My detailed comments are below.

1. Methods / Study population: Does the patient need to be &gt;18 on 1 Jan 2000? Or if they turn 18 after this would this be their start date?

2. Methods / Weight records: Why are implausible values dropped? The study is looking at whether weight has been measured, not whether it is correctly recorded or is determined plausible.

3. Methods / Baseline characteristics: 'closest record': was there any limit on how far before study entry the record was? It is common to use a cut-off and declare the value missing if the record is too long before the index date.

4. There is no mention of how missing data was handled. This is especially important given that the focus of the article is on whether weight is recorded (and hence missing). Please add a section to the Methods on this.

5. Methods / Repeat weight recording: to clarify, here only the time gap between the first and second weight record are examined? I.e. no subsequent weight records are considered in the Cox model (e.g. in a recurrent event fashion)?
6.

Discussion: it would be worth briefly discussing implications for research. Specifically, weight measures may be missing not at random, or subject to informative observation, and this needs to be considered in epidemiological studies using weight measures from primary care. We discussed this briefly in a similar paper that you might find relevant https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28423794 (as this is a self-cite I don't insist you add it!)

**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:

Acceptable
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