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Reviewer's report:

This is a good and informative paper, drawing on the findings from the study to inform potential changes to the intervention to enhance its potential effectiveness (a very useful summary is presented in Table 4). I recommend acceptance of the article with just one or two suggestions/suggested revisions.

Discretionary revisions:

1. For tables 1 and 2, I am doubtful about the value of presenting totals in each of the columns. For example, looking at Table 1, yes important to know the base total (i.e. need to keep totals in column 3); but in columns 4 and 5 the % is of that base total and thus the actual N for the cell is not needed (it can easily be calculated by the reader).

2. For tables 1 and 2, I would also suggest that, if N and % are required under journal guidelines, the order of the two is reversed (putting % first, with the N in brackets).

3. In Table 2, if my understanding is correct the significance testing for each item (e.g. self-efficacy, ‘weight loss’) comprises a comparison of the two groups (intervention, usual care) against the levels (low, medium, high) of weight loss. I wonder if this could be made clearer, as the indication of significance ** is located in the ‘high’ cell for the usual care group. Perhaps, add another column with this ** in; or, easier, put the ** in under the descriptor (weight loss **) for the row?

Minor essential revisions:

4. The paper would be strengthened further by the addition of an explicit short section, in the Discussion section, drawing out the implications of the study’s findings for actual practice (that is, for example, in the context of someone thinking through about taking the findings from this study and applying these to their practice). This would be very helpful for practice-oriented readers.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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