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Reviewer's report:

General

The authors have made an effort to address most of the concerns that arose during the review process. Some concerns remain.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1- Despite the fact that the authors have presented arguments to the effect that satiety and negative-allesthesia can be used interchangeably in the context of this paper, the reviewer still feels that the results and conclusions should be presented based on the measurements that were done. It is suggested that the authors refer to changes in negative allesthesia (that which was actually measured), and then interpret this as being suggestive of accelerated satiety and not equate the 2.

2- In the 3rd paragraph of the introduction, the authors state that "body weight is regulated" and that "the major signal responsible for the overall stability of body weight is the set-point". In the conclusion, one of the closing statement states that "Accelerated satiation, as seen in our participants, is interpreted here as due to a lowering of the body weight set-point". If this is so, this newly achieved body weight would then be defended against further deviation. How do the authors then reconcile this with the abundance of literature that supports that most obese individuals will likely return to their pre-weight loss body weight within a relatively short period of time? This does no fit with the conclusion presented. Is it possible that subjects were measured while still under the effects of the energy restricted diet? Timing of the post-diet measurement need to be included in the methods. Was there a weight stabilization period before post-intervention measurements were done?

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1-The literature that supports the body weight lowering effects of dietary calcium is losing speed. If the authors wish to keep this section of the discussion, it is suggested that they add recent references to balance their argument (Khashayar Sakhaee and Naim M. Maalouf. Dietary Calcium, Obesity and Hypertension—The End of the Road? J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2005 90: 4411-4413.; Ian R. Reid, et al. Effects of Calcium Supplementation on Body Weight and Blood Pressure in Normal Older Women: A Randomized Controlled Trial J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2005 90: 3824-3829).
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

1-The authors state that they have included the study of Dulloo in the introduction of the revised paper. Yet, it cannot be found in the introduction or in the reference list.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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