

Author's response to reviews

Title: Gendered dimensions of obesity in childhood and adolescence

Authors:

Helen N. Sweeting (helen@msoc.mrc.gla.ac.uk)

Version: 3 **Date:** 2 November 2007

Author's response to reviews:

Dear Dr Hiromichi Kumagai,

I am glad that you felt that my resubmission of 27th September addressed many of the reviewers' comments. Thank you for encouraging me to work further on the paper. Below I detail amendments made in response to your points.

Points 1 & 4 – Reductions to the length of manuscript, particularly the first section, and the number of references (to be limited to under 100).

– The text (excluding abstract) of the original submission ran at around 6,000 words, plus a table with obesity rates from 11 different countries and 147 references. Please note that because I was concerned about the paper's size, I e-mailed the Nutrition Journal editorial office prior to submission, attaching a copy of the paper, including the table and reference list. My message asked whether it might be suitable for publication and noted that – The length of this paper (main text approx 6,000 words) places it outside the word limit for many journals. The editorial office replied to say that it would be suitable for publication, which reassured me that the length would not be too much of a problem.

– The resubmission included amendments in response to one reviewer's request for increased detail, particularly in respect of quantitative aspects related to energy requirements and to include (and therefore discuss and reference) statistics on obesity rates from a much broader range of countries. At that stage I also took the chance to include references to a small number of more recent reviews. The main text of the resubmission increased to 6,900 words, the table to 33 countries and the references to 201.

– The present version is shorter, in particular the first section, as also suggested by the reviewer. The main text is now around 5,600 words (shorter than the original version and 18% shorter than the resubmission), the table is unchanged and the references number 172. I have not reduced the number of references further, because I think it would be difficult to do so without rather arbitrarily cutting some out, and had hoped that one of the ways in which this paper might be put to use would be as a source of further references by readers interested in particular sub-sections. Many journals allow reviews to include more references than original papers.

Point 2. The abstract should also be reorganized (350 words max, separate sections - Background, the context and purpose of the study; Methods, how the study was performed and statistical tests used; Results, the main findings; Conclusions, brief summary and potential implications).

¿ The Abstract has run at around 240 words in each version. The present version includes a structured abstract.

Point 3. Removal of such unusual representations as \$ in p3 and 4, pages or comments for references (p4, line 6; p6, line 9; p6 line 17 etc.), and insufficient quotation of sentences from references (p19, lines 14-16).

¿ The \$ was included to represent ¿wild cards¿ in the literature searches as used, for example, in the Cochrane Reviews. I have removed the \$ and described the search as including terms or variations in the terms.

¿ The small quotes with referenced page numbers have been removed.

I hope that this version will now be suitable for publication.

Yours sincerely,

Helen Sweeting.