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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions

1. The participants need to be more clearly defined. The introduction refers to "a range of people" yet it seems that only "m"oderately active and "c"ompetitively physically active" persons between the ages of ±19-40 years were included in the analysis? How the different categories were defined should be included. The title should also somehow indicate that the study was on a specific group of people. This is important as it may have influenced the results, for example, the level of importance placed on 'banned substances'.

2. The way in which the results are described is confusing in the sections "Information on the container label that influenced purchase of nutritional supplements" and "information not on container label". For example, the sentence "132 Respondents stated that the brand name influenced purchase....seems to include the 13% of participants that were NOT influenced by the brand name"? i.e. if they answered the question it does not necessarily imply that they were influenced by the Brand name.

3. It would be interesting to know how the purchasing of supplements by the 2 different groups (i.e moderately active vs competitively active) was influenced by label information and other factors (e.g media/gym/doctor). Was this data analyzed?

4. It should be made clear in the discussion that these findings relate to a particular group of people (i.e moderately active, physically active...) and younger/older/inactive persons may have responded differently (e.g banned substance information may not have been as important?). Study limitations should be highlighted. For example, no mention of parental influence in purchases?. There may also be a different influence between doctors/pharmacists and dietitians..?

5. In the conclusion, it is not clear what is meant by point (d).

6. Language and flow throughout requires attention and in some areas more explanation is required. For example, in Background pgf 1, difficult to read; under Materials and study population. pgf 3 "information and information.....information"; "truthfully and honestly" (=same?); in Results section "Information not on container label"...needs an introduction.
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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