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Editor's report

Title: Differential prevalence and associations of Overweight and Obesity by gender and population group among School Learners in South Africa.

Version: 2 Date: 09 June 2017

Editor: Dr Adrian Cameron

Reviewer's report:

General

None

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

None

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. Because of the way it was measured, the authors have decided to remove SEP from the analyses. This is probably a reasonable decision, but the absence of any SEP measures in the analysis is a significant limitation and that needs to be clear in the limitations section, especially given the importance of SEP in the associations reported.

We made amendments in the Limitation section to this end (Limitation section, lines 30-31, page 9).

2. I take the point of the reviewer who suggests the need for a Bonferroni correction. Although such corrections can be problematic, as the authors point out, at the very least, the authors need to make it clear in the statistical methods section and the limitations section, that the number of statistical tests conducted here mean that it is highly likely that at least some will be due to random associations.
We have incorporated the suggestion (Methods section, lines 7-8, page 6; Limitation section, lines 32-34, page 9).

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

None