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The peer review is for the article entitled “Does BMI generated by self-reported height and weight measure up in older adults from middle-income countries? Results from the Study on global AGEing and adult health (SAGE)”

Theresa E. Gildner, Tyler M. Barrett, Melissa A. Liebert, Paul Kowal and J. Josh Snodgrass

1. Is the question posed original, important and well defined?
The question posed by the authors is easily identifiable and understood. The results and discussions are in line with the study objectives as well.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
The methods used for data collection are appropriate and in line with the study objectives and design. Complete methodology is stated by the authors.

3. Are the data sound?
The data collected is in line with the objective of the study.

Discretionary Revisions

1. In reference with Table 1 of the study, values of measured and self reported height, weight and BMI if provided, along with the differences obtained among the self reported and measured BMI values would give complete information. Analysis according to weight status would also provide reliable information.

2. In reference with Table 4 of the study, categorization of weight status could be done for overweight, obese, normal weight and underweight, as studies have shown that different weight categories have different variations with respect to measured and self reported BMI.

3. Calculation of BMI relative error, can add to the analysis. Studies have also shown that ethnicity is an important factor, and causes variations in self reported and measured BMI values. Thus information on ethnicity, by country and adding this information to the analysis would have strengthened the results.

4. Dietary factors can also be included in the analysis for more information.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
The manuscript adheres to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
The interpretation of data has been supported by other studies and relevant references have been used. The results are interpreted in an unbiased manner, where both positive and negative results have been given equal importance. Discussion and conclusion are well balanced and are adequately supported by the data and studies done elsewhere.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
The limitations of the study are clearly stated.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building both published and unpublished?
The authors clearly acknowledge their work with respect to studies done elsewhere.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
The title and abstract convey the results of the study.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
The writing is acceptable.
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