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Reviewer’s report:

This is a second revision of a study presenting the initial 2-month Loozit weight loss data. The full Loozit intervention has been published elsewhere, and the RCT includes a 2 month intervention and then the participants are randomized to one of two follow-up arms. This paper is presenting the pre-post data from the first 2 months of the intervention.

Although the authors have been relatively responsive to the 3 reviewer’s comments, there are still concerns about this manuscript that dampen enthusiasm.

Major Compulsory Revisions

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.

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.

3) Another concern about this manuscript is the number of comparisons made. In tables 2, 3 and 4 there are 54 comparisons conducted. The authors should correct for multiple comparisons.

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.
Level of interest: An article of limited interest

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.
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