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**Reviewer’s report:**

The paper is the first of its kind for Kuwait addressing a very important public health need/service and suitable for the inclusion in this target journal.

**Major compulsory revisions**

**Abstract**

- Including % values for some results and mean (SD) values for others makes comparison of the results difficult. It may be more appropriate to show all results as % values (n=x) throughout, to provide the number of respondent and the overall % these reflect.
- The confusing presentation of the results does not allow the reader to corroborate the conclusion that overall responses to counselling can be “correlated with their comfort” levels of counselling.

**Results**

- As mentioned above the different descriptions of the results as % total and Mean (SD) make it difficult for the reader to compare the results and follow the main outcomes.
- I am unclear why the mean values are so low as most are within 2-4. Does that represent an average of 3-4 respondents out of a possible 186? And if that is the case why are the response rates so limited?

**Minor essential revisions**

**Abstract**

- It may be useful to include the themes of the questionnaire in the methods section as the results section keeps referring to “four aspects of obesity”. It is unclear to the reader which four aspects of obesity are referred to.
- Watch the grammar in some sentences esp. the conclusion.

**Methods**

- Did the study population include ALL full licensed pharmacist working in a community pharmacy? If so how many are there in total? – clarify!
- The sample size returned a figure of 186 pharmacists to be included – please clarify out of how many in total.
- Please clarify who developed the questionnaire and how it was validated.
• How was random sampling and stratification done – clarify!
• How were pharmacies approached – face to face, letter, email? – please clarify.
• Please clarify how the completed questionnaires were returned as the last sentence on page 8 states that they were collected after completion and the following sentence states that the participants were asked to return them anonymously.
• Grammar

Results
• I am unfamiliar with the use of r-values – please clarify.

Discussion/Conclusion
• It would be beneficial to the context of the findings and the paper to compare the findings to other countries than the USA alone. This is not only true for the study findings but also were the use of technical support within community pharmacy is suggested, a system which has been successfully employed in many European countries as well as the USA.
• Aspects such as areas of future research and strengths and weaknesses of the study should be addressed more thoroughly.

Discretionary revisions

Abstract
• The last sentence in the Conclusion section sounds like a statement of more study results “Pharmacists are widely accepted as he most accessible health care providers, given the effective professional service training and practical skills…” – I can’t see any evidence for the data collection as part of this study. If these are not principal findings maybe re-word.
• Watch the grammar in some sentences esp. the conclusion.

Introduction
• Very informative and reads well. Some minor grammatical and punctuation errors.

Results
• In order to make it easier to follow the coherent flow of the results section it may be useful to use subheadings under which the results of the main study themes are illustrated.

Discussion/Conclusion
• All results are addressed, however this section could maybe benefit from using subheadings more effectively as the current layout just uses a string of new paragraphs which impairs the text flow.
• The final paragraph in the Conclusion is not needed.
• Watch the grammar throughout (overweight is used as an noun but probably better as an adjective).
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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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