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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
None

Minor Essential Revisions
1. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
Yes, but suggest the following changes:
An explanation of why socio-economic questions were included would have been helpful. A database is referred to, but no details provided – please describe the database.
The questionnaire has been developed from guidelines, these should be referenced.
Step 1: An explanation of the process adopted for defining the KNOA concepts should be included.
Step 2: An explanation of the process adopted for compiling the sentences and grouping them into the 7 dimensions should be included. How many primary care practitioners were involved and how did they assess the questionnaire?
Step 3: numbers of physicians, nurses and dentists should be given that make up the primary care practitioner group. How were they selected?

2. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Yes, the strengths and weaknesses of the study are adequately discussed. The issue of how this work could be taken forward and how it might need to be developed to ensure validity in other countries could have been briefly discussed. The barriers to discussing "nutrition" are listed at the end of Table 2 but not discussed in the Results with the other data reported from Table 2 or in the Discussion.

3. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
A comment on the cultural specificity of the tool’s development and use would be helpful.

Minor issues not for publication
A few minor grammatical errors:

1. Methods: 1st paragraph, last sentence (second half). The meaning is not clear.
2. Methods: Step 3, line 2 should read “accordance”, not according
3. Use of American English spellings (UK: counselling, programme) and terms “candy” (UK: confectionery)
4. Table 1: is "propedeutices the right term?"
5. Table 3: should this read "10% to 15%", not 10 and 15%
6. Table 5: should read Unsatisfactory, not "Insatisfactory". Regular is not a usual classification of questionnaire responses. Suggest "satisfactory" is used.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests: I declare that I have no competing interests