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To the Editor,

Re: Manuscript #2396045823803252

Manuscript Title: Short-term outcomes of community-based adolescent weight management: The Loozit® Study

Thank you for providing the opportunity to respond to the second round of comments from the reviewers. We note that reviewer 1 and 3 are now satisfied with the manuscript. On the following pages we address four comments made by reviewer 2.

We resubmit a track changed version of the manuscript, Figure and four Tables. To avoid confusion we have accepted all the ‘tracked changes’ indicated in our first resubmission. Hence, all ‘tracked changes’ presently shown are in response to this second round of comments from reviewer 2.

If there is any further information that you require please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Vanessa Shrewsbury
On behalf of the Loozit Study Team
## Response to Reviewer 2 Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer’s comments</th>
<th>Authors’ response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) This is a short-term pre-post assessment of a community intervention for overweight and obese adolescents. These data are part of a larger RCT, which includes a 2 month treatment, and randomization to one of two interventions. The authors would like to publish the interim 2 month data. There is no follow-up timepoint and no control group. The data, as it now stands, may be more appropriate for a brief, or, the authors can choose to present it when they publish the full RCT.</td>
<td>The rationale for this study is that community-based (i.e. low-moderate intensity) adolescent group programs for obesity treatment are a relatively understudied intervention. The few studies that were directly comparable to the Phase 1 Loozit intervention (i.e similar format and intensity) are outlined in our discussion. Those studies were all from the USA, were published over twenty years ago and had less than half the sample size. We also discuss studies of a similar format with a greater intensity of contact. We would like the Editor to consider the need to expand the evidence-base by providing readers with contemporary methods and outcome data on community-based adolescent group programs for obesity treatment in full manuscript form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Although the authors were requested to be cautious about their interpretations of the data in the last submission of this MS, there are still concerns about the language used to describe the results of this study. For example, the authors state in the revised manuscript “This two month community-based group lifestyle intervention was successful in reducing BMI and waist circumference in the majority of adolescent participants.” However, the data show that “At two months, 22% had reduced BMI z-score by more than five percent, and 38% had reduced WHtR by more than five percent.” The data do not suggest that this intervention was successful for the “majority” of the participants.</td>
<td>In addressing the first round of reviewers’ comments we used the term ‘stablizing’ in the abstract conclusion to summarize the intervention effect. We thank the reviewer for bringing this inconsistency in the discussion to our attention. The sentence referred to by the reviewer has now been changed to “This two month community-based group lifestyle intervention was successful in stabilizing BMI and waist circumference in the majority of adolescent participants” and we have added “A five percent or greater reduction in BMI z-score and WHtR was achieved by almost a quarter and over a third of adolescents respectively”. We do not believe there are any other sections of the manuscript where the wording should be further tempered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Another concern about this manuscript is the number of comparisons made. In tables 2, 3 and</td>
<td>Our first response to the reviewer on this point was “With regards to the comment regarding adjustments for multiple</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


4 there are 54 comparisons conducted. The authors should correct for multiple comparisons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4) The numbers of people included do not match up with Table 2. Should be 66 + 64 = 130; Table 2 includes 129. Please review all the tables in the manuscript and check the number of participants included in each analyses.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The resubmitted Table 2 already includes the following footnote regarding this matter:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Of the 130 adolescents who completed the 2 month program, one adolescent with self-reported anthropometry was excluded from the data analysis leaving 129 cases. With regards to the blood data, 20 study completers refused to have a blood test at either time point and a further 8 study completers who had a blood test in the non-fasted state were also excluded (one adolescent also had invalid LDL data).”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3 already included the footnote:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“e 48 adolescents who reported levels of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sedentary leisure activities considered implausible (i.e. exceeding 72 hours/week) were excluded from these analyses as per established protocols”. We have now added a footnote with the following information “Data are reported for all adolescents who completed questionnaire items”.

**Table 4**
We have added the following footnote “Data are reported for all adolescents who completed questionnaire items”