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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting, useful and well-written article. My only suggestions for improvement are below.

Firstly, it is sometimes not clear what time scale is used for the questions, without referring to the questionnaire. A number of times I wondered if the time scale was "ever" or "in the past 12 months?" e.g: in:

- the abstract: Only 20% of the sample had sought GP support for weight loss
- the methods: previous weight loss and weight loss maintenance success

Ensuring the time scale of any question is recommended.

Second, additional discussion of the limitations of the study are recommended:

- While sampling from those with recorded obesity is described as a strength, it is also a source of bias. We know that BMI is not always recorded by general practices, so the sample is likely to not represent all patients with obesity. It might, for example, only represent patients whose obesity concerned the GP sufficiently for that GP to record BMI.
- The study is cross-sectional so relationships can only be described, causality cannot be asserted.

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