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Reviewer's report:

I thank the authors for submitting this manuscript. It is an excellent short paper which I enjoyed reading and which contains some very interesting data. The manuscript is written in a very clear and informative manner. I have only minor comments.

ABSTRACT:
This was nicely written and clear generally. The second sentence of the Methods has no verb and is just a list rather than a sentence - please add a verb for clarity.

INTRODUCTION:
This is very brief but is written in a very clear and logical manner. It summarises the findings of previous studies that have examined the topic, and clarifies the gap in knowledge being addressed. As it is brief you could expand on some of the key literature.

It could be worth adding a hypothesis at the end - what did you hypothesise would be the outcome of the analysis? I don't think that is crucial but many readers would be interested.

METHODS:
Again this is very clear and logical overall.
P 6 L36 - could you set out the LSI acronym in full if it is the first time in the text.

RESULTS/
This is clear and nicely set out.
Table 3 - I suggest presenting the data with 1 decimal place for H, W, and BMI.

DISCUSSION
This is set out very logically, and the inferences made are clear and robust, supported by the data. This section starts with a summary of the main findings which was clear and very accessible to the lay reader.

P 10 para 3 has an interesting discussion of the psychological outcomes that was very clear. The Limitations section is strong and the first couple of paragraphs there raise some pertinent issues for the area.
Conclusion - you could probably make stronger conclusions to end this paper. This seemed a very modest statement, almost as if little could be concluded from your data.
Overall I thought this was an excellent paper.

**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**
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