



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_9362
Title of the Manuscript:	The study of social profile and some health problems associated with body weight disorders in upper Egypt male youth
Type of the Article	Cross sectional study

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	About the causation of overweight and obesity: Mange relevant perspectives have n Been described. Meanwhile the psychosocial determinants are not described at all. The methods part is very head to read. Making minor parts would help. All the interview parts have been mentioned but where are the results of these?	In the introduction section, lines 5-6, number the behavioural and psychological factors have been addressed: "d) behavioral factors, while eating when food is available, heavy night eating, eating when depressed,....." However, and as per your request, more on the psychology of obesity will be added in this edited manuscript as follows: "d) behavioral and psychological factors: eating when food is available, eating when depressed, eating associated with other activities, such as reading and TV watching, eating when depressed, and inability to differentiate between bodily sensations and emotional state, all have an apparent role in weight gain and obesity,[3]" The methods part has been rewritten and simplified, as pr your request. See the attached edited manuscript. The interview included: vital signs, BP, chest exam, heart exam, abdomen, BMI, blood glucose to diagnose DM. I believe it would not be indicated to further classify patients again according to their chest exam result, and then according to the cardiac exam results, and so forth. The focus of the study from the comorbidity and physical health status standpoint is DM and hypertension, not abdominal or cardiac problems. Such results could be seat for a separate research. From the ethical standpoint, in such a hospital-setting research, clinicians have to examine patients, reassure them about their health and also to determine their fitness to participate and continue



SDI Review Form 1.6

		with the study project. Lastly, any clinical data that might not be used this time could be used later on for further research. Eventually, the answer to this reviewer's question: "All the interview parts have been mentioned but where are the results of these?" is that: Thereby, we see that the results of the clinical interviews that are within the domain of this research, which are DM and hypertension, in the absence of other comorbidities that can jeopardize the subjects' participatory opportunity have already been mentioned enough in the results section, including Tables 2. Definitely. More detailing of the questionnaire scales, items, and scoring will be added to the methodology section of the edited manuscript, as per your request. The paper contained 3 tables not 2. The work was limited to studying the influence of socioeconomic class, DM and HTN on obesity among participants from the three governorates. Within the scope and space limit of this paper, further information might be studied in a separate future research. The recruitment of participants is a straightforward systematic sampling technique. We have explained in detail how it was done. However, another reviewer asked us avoid such explanation because once the word "systematic technique" has been mentioned no more explanation is needed. That this detailing will be removed from the text in the edited copy. The selection of the study sample subjects (250 from Qena=50%, 200 from Luxor=40%, and 50 from Al Bahr Alahmar=10) was meant to be as close to the actual distribution of the male populations 18-60y in the actual study region (Qena governorate), Since Qena, a labour attraction area, has a male 18-60y ld population (mostly from the workforce) in the following proportions: 54% original Qena residents, 28%t luxor immigrants, 9% Albahr Alahmar immigrants, 9% other immigrants.
	Better description of which questionnaires have been used? How have the scoring been mad? Only two tables are overall presented- there must be	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	more specific results? The recruitment of the participants is a bit hard to understand. Better description is needed to ensure that the 500 participants are representative for the 3 regions. Perhaps a flowchart? Otherwise the results cannot be used with a good validation	Notably, the sample distribution based on the subjects' original residence was closely similar to the distribution of male counterparts in the general population of Qena. Thereby, representativeness is pretty much assured. All this will be addressed in the edited manuscript, as per your request.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	In general a very interesting and relevant paper. About the causation of overweight and obesity: Mange relevant perspectives have n Been described.	Thank you so much, wishing to meet expectations.

NB.

Two copies of the edited manuscript are attached herewith: a cooled one with highlights and a clean copy without highlights.

Most edited parts in response to this reviewer's notes have been highlighted green, so please follow up.