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Reviewer's report:

Although I am a paediatrician, I work in an academic setting and thoroughly enjoyed reading this paper and am encouraged by the results! Have a few reservations (see comments below) before I am convinced that the results are sustainable and generalizable.

MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS

1) Spelling mistake: Abstract, Results paragraph: (counseling "started" at..) instead of "stared at".
2) Protocol, Dietary assessment paragraph: missing open bracket " [ " around citations 8,9.
3) Results, Patients paragraph: Missing closed bracket " ) " in last sentence after 4.14 mmol/L in Group A
4) Result, Lipids second paragraph, last sentence: forgot to put in Group "A" occurred and Group "B" occurred

DISCRETIONARY REVISIONS

1) Participants paragraph- why were patients with a food score >250 excluded? Would they not be the ones to most likely benefit the most from the intervention?
2) Counseling materials: 98 page book as part of the educational materials, how much did it cost? How and why would another primary care clinic invest in this cost (primarily privately run, fee for service clinics)? This would be a barrier to implementing this intervention.
3) For demographic characteristics, instead of years of education, it would be helpful to know how many individuals had post secondary education. It is also important to note is the socioeconomic status (SES) of your population as we know people of lower SES have additional barriers to living healthy. If this was conducted in a primarily "middle class" population, would the results of the intervention hold for a lower SES population?
4) Could you look at the data by age groups and see which age group the intervention was most beneficial?
5) If group B had a statistically significant improvement in overall diet score between visit 1 and 2 (just from having contact with PCP), is the dietary intervention required? Could the improvement between V2 and V3 be attributed to individuals being motivated after reviewing lab results?

For future studies, maybe this could be an additional arm (review labs but no diet intervention at V2).

6) How do you explain the big jump in the percentage of those in Group B that ended up with "very good" diet quality at the end of 6 months (after 3 months of intervention) in comparison to Group A that had a longer period of time for the intervention? Was it because of worsening lipid markers from V1 to V2 being the motivator?

7) Table 2: Is there a way to report this data in a way that flows better? ie would it be better to have Time (V1 V2 V3, V2 vs V1 etc) along the top for both Group A and B?
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