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**Reviewer's report:**

Calling height, weight and bmi classical and waist, hip and WHR ‘newer’ is somewhat confusing as none of these measures are really new. I would suggest overall and regional obesity measures or do not distinguish groups at all.

The percent difference values are tough to interpret, particularly as there are clear sex differences. Adjusted mean differences in cm should be given instead.

Also, the more important thing to know would be if the error caused misclassification and thus improper clinical decision making as a result.

The clinical utility of the study is unclear given that waist hip and whr are not used to dictate weight management.

Were the physicians and techs told to measure at the same sites (I.e. Minimal waist versus iliac crest)

Why are there significant errors in the measurement of body weight within each bmi group. That would suggest a systematic difference in how weight is measured. This should be discussed.

All analyses should be stratified by sex.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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