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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have analyzed the effectiveness of intervention to promote health among participants attending primary care. The final result is these interventions give small beneficial changes in consumption of fruit, vegetables, fiber anf fat over 12 months. In order to increase the value of the manuscript, the authors should take into account the following:

Major points:

1. This reviewer is surprised about the differences in the results obtained by the authors of this manuscript and those reported by Ress K et al (ref. 11) in their Cochrane systematic review. The causes of such big differences should be analyzed and discussed in the paper.

2. It seems that the authors were very restricted in the selection of the studies included in the review. Why they exclude studies on asymptomatic participants with high-risk status or even established medical conditions? If the aim of the authors was to evaluate the effectiveness of intervention to promote healthy diets among participants with "healthy status", why they do not select studies on community-based participants? The rationale of their study should be explained better.

3. The results of this review are too descriptive. I miss a deeper analysis of the results. For instance, comparing the mode of administration or the diet assessment tool (telephone interview, etc.) with the final results,

Minor points

1. Explain better why trials comparing one type of diet promotion intervention with another only were excluded? (page 5).
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