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Reviewer's report:

This is a randomized trial that reports on long-term efficacy of a Web-based computer-tailored nutrition education intervention for adults including cognitive and environmental feedback. In general the paper reads well. However, the following points should be clarified:

Background
- Please insert related reference at the line 134.

Method:
- Which variable are used to detect an intervention effect for calculation of the sample size?
- How the authors considered BMI as a secondary outcome?
- The type of randomization; details of any restriction should be clearly stated in details.
- The method used to generate the random allocation sequence should be clearly stated.
- The mechanism used to implement the random allocation sequence (such as sequentially numbered containers), describing any steps taken to conceal the sequence until interventions were assigned should be clearly stated.

Results and discussion:
- While the author declared that the study used of Theory of Planned Behavior and the Precaution Adoption Process Model and…(line 225 and 226), why didn’t the author mentioned in the other parts of study? How the author used this theories and models in the study without any explained them in results or discussion?
- While the majority of the article is about using of targeting self-regulation processes, environmental-level factors and goal setting and action- and coping planning …., but it’s not debate in discussion that how these factors influence on participant or why it’s not work in this study in more details?
- The discussion does not compare the results with other studies and is more like an introduction of an article.
- The statistical analysis and limitations of the study is too long, it’s better that briefly outlining the key and main points.
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