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Reviewer's report:

This paper continues to be interesting and the authors have done a good job in addressing the comments I made on the earlier draft. There remain two minor issues which I would like the authors to take into consideration.

1. Thank you very much for providing a graphical presentation of the results, this makes processing the information much easier. Would it be able to indicate differences between the two types of studies for each of the components in the graph (at the moment it looks like only the active ingredients differ significantly)?

2. In Box 2, the authors provide an example of codings that have been undertaken for the title “Treatment of childhood obesity by retraining eating behaviour: randomised controlled trial.”. Active ingredients are coded as absent from this title. However, it could be argued that the active ingredient in this title would be ‘retraining eating behaviour’. This would be in line with the codings provided in supplement 4, which often outline target behaviours for change (e.g. ‘exercise’) as the active ingredient. It seems as though the coding of an active ingredient is a matter of focus. A behavioural intervention might be described as targeting obesity through activity change in which case activity would be the active ingredient. The same intervention could however be described as targeting physical activity, in which case behaviour change techniques such as action planning and/or self-monitoring would be considered to be the active ingredients. Please outline how a potential difference in coding of active ingredients depending on the level of study description has been taken into consideration during codings of active ingredients. This is particularly important when considering that data was coded by one author only.
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