Reviewer's report

Title: Prevalence and factors associated with overweight and obesity among adults in Hawassa city, Southern Ethiopia: A community based cross-sectional study

Version: 1 Date: 29 Oct 2018

Reviewer: Susan Clifford

Reviewer's report:

Thank you to the authors for revising the paper in response to the reviewers' comments. The majority of my comments have been adequately addressed. I have a few further comments on the authors' responses - please see below.

General comments

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

Specific comments

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.

Comment 20 [Line 36: 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.

Comment 32 [Line 135: How was the overall activity level (L, M, H) derived from the three separate context activity levels? Can you describe what levels of activity are considered low, moderate and high (e.g. 30 minutes of activity that makes heartbeat rise?)]
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.

Comment 34 [Line 145: Suggest including a supplementary table describing how the independent variables were measured in the questionnaire (what were the response options?)

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

Comment 26 [Line 157: What were the covariates in the adjusted models? Can you clarify if the multivariable models were run separately for each risk factor (i.e. adjusted for covariates), or if all risk factors were entered into the same multivariable model. I presume the first.]

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.

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?

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?

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?
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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