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Reviewer's report:

As I stated in my previous review, I enjoyed reading this paper. I want to clarify that in my previous review I did not state that the manuscript was unsuitable for publication, however, I felt the manuscript was unsuitable for publication in the journal it was submitted to (BMC Public Health). The manuscript has been revised and in parts are much clearer. However, I do still have a few comments that I feel need to be addressed before it can be published in BMC Obesity.

Major compulsory revisions
- The introduction still lacks information about why this study is needed. The authors outline that there a lack of UK studies but the outline of why anti-fat attitudes need to be researched is limited. Reviewer 2's second primary concern is related to this point and has been addressed to some extent but more is needed.
- The study is the first large sample in the UK but the discussion still lacks detail that would make this article relevant to public health practitioners and obesity researchers. The suggestion that an antifat attitude intervention is needed is not supported with further discussion about what these interventions should look like. The findings need to be discussed in the context of public health policy. Reviewer 2's comments made me consider if more analysis is needed to examine some of the associations. This may give the authors more to discuss in relation to policy.

Minor essential revisions
- The abstract lacks detail that is important to the reader (e.g., why is ant-fat attitude of importance? what are the implications of these findings?)
- Sex or gender? I would suggest gender is more appropriate as you are not measuring things relating to biological make-up
- There is a lot of discussion in research and clinical practice about using the term 'obese'. So more contribution to this is great. However, your sample was mostly normal weight people so can you make the claims that you make on page 13 about the use of the term 'obese' when treating people? Also, the sentence on line 9-11 should be reworded as you say that using the term 'obese' should be avoided but then you state 'obese people'

Discretionary revisions
- There are still a few typos (e.g., Running head)
- The BAOP scores are interesting and could be discussed more (especially the underweight participants)

- Page 9, the MANOVA main effects should be listed in the same order as they are then discussed below (e.g., age is first in your list but sex is the first to be discussed)

- I agree with two of the other reviewers that this manuscript would suit a short report.
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