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Reviewer's report:

Major comments:

Abstract 1. Methods- first sentence of the methods line 33-34 needs correction.

Introduction 1. The last sentence of the first paragraph of the introduction, line 61-66 is long and windy with missing words. The meaning will be clearer if shorter statements are used.

2. The second paragraph with the example of China line 70-74 is not appropriately linked with the flow of the paragraph. The example needs to be linked up well with the current analysis; otherwise it seems so out of place.

3. I suggest that the use of ‘Paralleling,….’ In line 95 be replaced with a word that shows a relation between the two conditions e.g. ‘Accompanying’ may be more appropriate. Parallels may not directly indicate relationship.

Methods 1. In describing the main dependent variable, BMI the categories used did not include Underweight < 18 kg/m2. What happened to the underweight women, were they excluded? I believe it is important that this is stated and described appropriately.

2. Authors should be mindful of the verb tense used in the methods under ‘Independent Variables’. Both the past and present are used interchangeably- consistency is key.

3. Method of analysis- the writing in this section should be made more scientific by avoiding the overuse of personal pronouns- ‘we’

Results 1. In Table 1, since a common denominator is being used, there is no need for the ‘NOs’. Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Television</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>47.85</td>
<td>1,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>52.15</td>
<td>2,091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is so clear that 47.85 + 52.15 = 100. Only the Yes items and the totals should be presented for such binary responses. The presentation will be more reader friendly that way.

2. In line 187-188 ‘Obesity was three times more common among women whose
households own a television set compared to women who belong to households that do not own a television set (Table 2).

Such statements seem repetitive and unscientific. Authors should correct all such repetitive statement in the results.

3. The results section is overly long. Authors tended to repeat almost all the findings in the Tables. The results should be more focused; present major highlight and not to repeat all information in the tables.

4. Language in the results and the whole document ought to be improvement. Generally the results section should be re-written.

Discussion 1. ‘Television ownership was however, found be marginally associated with increased odds of overweight (P < 0.10)’ The statement in line 232-233 is missing a word and I don’t understand the statistical basis of the ‘marginal’ as used here.

2. Authors have provided different published articles on obesity and household assets in the discussion. However, in the introduction I was made to believe there was little or no published data on the subject.

I will suggest the authors tone down on the gap that this paper is to fill; probably it is too strongly portrayed in the introduction.

Conclusion Reflects the study findings

Tables and figures 1. In Table 2, what was the decision –significant or not, for Motor cycle and Bicycle with p-values 0.057- I was not clear on this.

References Should conform to the journal requirement, especially in citing from a book.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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