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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revision
1. This article needs more detail on the collection of data for costs and quality of life. How was this collected (telephone / letter / interview / questionnaire) and how many people contributed data. Where were salary costs taken from? How is the cost of the physical activity estimated? How many people contributed to the cost and quality of life data?

2. The calculation of the cost effectiveness appears incorrect. According to your QoL table, the gain in QoL in 1 year was 0.035, therefore for two years the QALY gain should be double this, ie 0.07, rather than 0.087. Similarly with the calculation for follow-up + 3 years.

3. Assuming the quality of health gain persist for a further year appears optimistic, given the likelihood of patients regaining weight in subsequent years. I would suggest using a 1 year follow up for your base case.

Minor Essential revisions
1. From a cost utility perspective, confidence intervals are more pertinent than p values. Please show the confidence intervals around the intervention effects and show sensitivity analyses varying the QoL gain according to the ranges of the confidence interval.

2. For table 4, the results are presented as net monetary benefits. This is non intuitive to most readers. The results should be shown as ICERs in the sensitivity analyses. The results can be shown on a cost effectiveness acceptability curve to show the effect of different cost effectiveness thresholds.

3. The perspective is given as health care perspective but in fact the analysis includes the participants’ travel expenses which is inconsistent with the perspective chosen.

4. The reference to the ScHARR report is incorrect and should be corrected. The authors should explain the differences between their results and those from ScHARR, with justification if necessary.

5. The authors should refer to Loveman et al. 1 for more information on the cost effectiveness of long term weight management schemes.
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