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Reviewer’s report:

Major compulsory revisions
1. Title needs to reflect the setting of the study
2. Abstract methods do not describe in sufficient detail the questionnair.
3. Abstract conclusions repeat results and makes suggestions not supported by data.
4. Both Background and Discussion contain references to Kuwaiti practice (perhaps more than may be needed), many to USA practice and some to Australian practice, but none to practice in other countries. Many of these references are very old and seem of little direct relevance to the work. Other recent references to relevant work on weight management in the UK and systematic reviews on pharmacy role in weight management are not cited. The literature review is thus not comprehensive. Published work is also available on general public views of pharmacy weight management services and pharmacy public health services in general, which is also not cited.
5. It is not clear why it was decided to calculate a sample size based on obtaining a difference of 20% in population between two groups. This seems a most unusual method and needs some justification and further explanation.
6. Authors need to provide details in the main paper on how pharmacies were selected, (abstract gives some information).
7. Explain how the questionnaire was modified after piloting.
8. State how many data collectors were used and how consistency in approach between data collectors was guaranteed/ maximised.
9. Explain how data collectors ensured anonymity of responses. If they were truly anonymous, confidentiality is not an issue.
10. State how many pharmacies were approached to participate.
11. Give more details of how t tests were used and correlations were carried out. The statistical methods given in methods are not the same as those reported in results. It is not possible to assess the suitability of the statistical analysis as insufficient details are provided.
12. The Discussion includes a small section on limitations, but no mention of strengths. Self-reporting and social desirability bias are the only limitations mentioned. No comment is made on the suitability or limitations of the
questionnaire used, sampling or response rate.

13. The Conclusion requires re-drafting. The first paragraph simply re-iterates results and method and the second paragraph makes sweeping generalisations, not drawn from the data in this paper.

Minor Essential Revisions

14. The English requires attention throughout.

15. The Discussion would be enhanced by expansion of comments on the current suitability of pharmacists expertise in dietary management for weight control, bearing in mind that pharmacists are not trained dieticians, and the somewhat surprising finding that they feel more confident in providing this as opposed to counseling on product use.

16. No mention is made of the type of interventions pharmacists may need to deliver to support weight management, such as motivational interviewing, or behaviour change therapy.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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