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Author’s response to reviews:

Point by point response to the comments of the reviewers

Reviewer 1

Comment 1: There are also some errors in the newly inserted passages (spelling errors, grammatical errors) that need to be corrected. Furthermore, missing blank spaces, missing prepositions and articles make it sometimes difficult to read the text.

Response: Thank you. The manuscript is now thoroughly edited

Reviewer 2:

Comment 1: The supplementary material needs to be cross-cited in the main text (otherwise, how will readers know to look at it?).

Response: The supplementary file is now cross-cited in the manuscript (Page 9). The second supplementary material that intended to provide detailed information on the study setting is now removed thinking it may not be very relevant to readers.

Comment 2: Comment 16 [Results: How well does the sample assessed represent the adult population of the city? Were some groups over or under-represented?]
Thank you for explaining in the response table how the sample reflection of the population was investigated. I think it is vital that information about how representative the sample is of the population is provided in the paper.

Response: in the last paragraph of the discussion section, we have now commented on the representativeness of the sample.

Comment 3: Comment 20 [Promoting these healthy lifestyle habits rarely translates to weight change. Suggest instead focusing in the conclusion on the relative impact that each risk factor has on BMI (which strongly predict BMI, and which don't really seem to be associated).]

The authors have amended the discussion, in response to a comment on the abstract. I think the abstract would be strengthen by also updating the abstract text, but this change is at the authors' discretion.

Response: Thank you for making this comment optional. We have preferred to maintain the abstract as it is.

Comment 4: Follow-up to Comment 32. Thank you for adding the general definitions to the manuscript; this is really helpful. The additional information in the supplementary material is well intentioned, but currently difficult to follow - what do P1-P17 represent? I recommend either adding the P1-P17 questions, or removing the equations containing P1-P17 and instead explaining generally how the data were scored.

Response: The equation containing P1-P17 is now removed from the supplementary file. In the data collection sub-section citation is now give to explain how the scoring and classification was made.

Comment 6: The FFQ appears to include 13 food groups, but the paper mentions 12? Please check.

Response: Thank you for the critical observation. Fast foods (burger, pizza, sandwich) was included in the old version of the questionnaire but the latest version that we used for data collection is with the 12 food groups. Now the questionnaire in the supplementary table is amended accordingly

Comment 7: Comment 26 Thank you for clarifying that a multivariable model was run. I think it is important that the covariates in this model are provided in the paper.
Response: I think there is misunderstanding regarding the multivariable model. The 10 variables in table 4 are the covariates included in the model. There is no other variable that had been adjusted but not presented in the paper.

Comment 8: Comment 39 [Line 234: It's not clear from the methods what the 24 variables are? I count 17. Please include a supplementary table showing the odds ratio and p-value for all variables considered for inclusion in the multivariate model (and therefore, which 10 have a p<0.25).] I'm sorry; I still don't understand which variables were included in the model. 12 food group variables + 10 with p<0.25 - what are the remaining 5 variables, to get to 27 in the model?

Response: we have now provided the list of the 27 variables (i.e. 15 socio-demographic variables and 12 food groups) in the “variables of the study sub-section”. Among these variables 10 had p-value less than 0.25 hence considered for the multivariable model.

Comment 9: When the results text refers readers to the methods part, do you mean 'Variables of the study'? If so, can you update the results text to be more specific?

Response: Yes. Correction is now made in the results section (“Factors associated with overweight and obesity” sub-section).

Comment 10: Comment 40 [Line 241 onwards: Are the odds ratios presented adjusted odds ratios? Please specify.] The authors' response states the manuscript was updated, but I can't see where the change was made. Can you please confirm where the text was added?

Response: sorry for this silly error. We have now added an explanation under the results section (“Factors associated with overweight and obesity” sub-section).