Reviewer's report

Title: Diet, physical exercise and cognitive behavioural training as a combined workplace based intervention to reduce body weight and increase physical capacity in health care workers - a randomized controlled trial

Version: 2 Date: 13 May 2011

Reviewer: Mogens Theisen MP Pedersen

Reviewer's report:

Well written article with important results. However I have a main concern about the statistic part which could change some of the results. This is explained in the specific comments below. I suggest a minor revision before accepting the article.

Specific comments
s. 4
Cognitive behavioral counseling/training is presented like a concept well known to the reader. It should be more clearly defined in the article with proper references for more information. What is special with CBT compared to counseling in general? This should be elaborated more in detail and included more in the discussion. What might be the role of CBC in the successful weight loss?.
p. 9
The physical training is poorly described including in reference 21. Why did the authors from the beginning expect an effect of 10-15 min of training compared to the evidence based knowledge of training progression models? What about the leisure time physical activity? Did they actually do anything? The results of using logbooks is not presented...why?
Why did the authors choose the different strength test? Were they related to the training?
In the discussion the physical training intervention part is stressed as an important part. Is it really so important? This should be discussed in more detail in relation to my concern above.

Page 10/ abstract
An incremental maximal test was used to estimate VO2max…but in the abstract authors describe that a submaximal test was used. This should be clarified.

Page 12
Statistics
Authors used an ANNOVA to look for differences in changes between groups; but did you control for the effect of clusters? If not this should be done.
The same statistical test was used 17 times (table 3) to look for an intervention effect. This increases the possibility of a false positive result. The significance level therefore should be decreased (lower P).

Page 14. Line 7
…”.the lower part of table 2 shows”……this must be a mistake?….I don’t understand.

Table 1
Education…..what is meant by “Health care wo” ?

Discussion
Limitations of the work are not mentioned, but should be clearly stated.

**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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