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**Reviewer's report:**

Thank you for the opportunity to review this submission. This is an important and interesting topic and a well written paper. It focuses on whether a nurse led motivational intervention is more effective than a traditional intervention in promoting weight loss and its maintenance over a 24 month period. I have very few comments for consideration by the authors:

- The protocol has already been published. There is an overview of the methods included but some information is lacking on how randomisation took place etc. The reader is however, directed to the published protocol.

- The results, and figure 2, state that 1200 patients were initially included but 846 randomised. Please include an overview of reasons for the initial exclusions.

- The results show that both groups lose weight with the motivational intervention group losing significantly more weight at both 12 and 24 months. The results also talk about the number of patient who lost 5% and 10% of their starting weight. However, it is not clear why these figures are important. I would be interested to read some clarity on the impact to health of a 5% or 10% weight loss and what we should be aiming for.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review? If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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