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Reviewer's report:

General comments

This article presents interesting results related to the reduction of body weight as well as compliance with dietary recommendations. Weight reduction is usually a long-term process requiring a large regime. The lack of effects is often explained by the diet restriction, which results in low compliance. The problem of overweight and obesity is a current problem observed in many countries, so the subject discussed in the article is very current and has a practical aspect. Below are some comments and suggestions for authors.

Comments and Suggestions for Authors:

Title: Does diet strictness level during weekends and holiday periods influence long-term weight loss maintenance? Evidence from the Portuguese Weight Control Registry. I suggest changing the terminology from "long term" to "1-year follow-up".

Preparing manuscript: Abstract briefly summarize the aim, participants, results and conclusions. Text of abstract is without abbreviations and not cite references. The body of the article was broken into subsections such as: introduction, methods, results, discussion and conclusions. The abbreviations are used in the text were defined at first use. Manuscripts includes all required declarations such as: ethics approval and consent to participate, consent for publication, availability of data and material, competing interests, funding, authors' contributions as well as acknowledgements. The authors did not include "Authors' information" but it was only optional.

Methods - subjects:

Line 14 (page 4): the Authors wrote: "All the individuals who met the eligibility criteria were invited to perform all the assessments at the Exercise and Health Laboratory of the Faculty of Human Kinetics, University of Lisbon. Those who could not visit the Laboratory received by mail a (partial) battery of questionnaires". Please explain how exactly did the two assessments differ?
Methods - assessments:

Line 24 (page 4): the Authors wrote: "Diet strictness was assessed with the questions: "During the weekend do you maintain the same diet regimen that you adopt during the week?" and "During holidays do you maintain the same diet regimen that you adopt during the rest of the year?", answered on a 7-point scale, from 1 (more strict during the weekend/holidays) to 7 (less strict during the weekend/holidays)." I would like more details on the scale was used? If it was referred to the subjective assessment of examined subjects or did it include any distinguishing features related to the diet regime? I suggest detailing the assessment.

Line 37-38 (page 4): the Authors wrote "… body weight was measured twice …" and then "Height was measured…" Please explain, whether all persons included in the study were measured or whether data was collected in a different way? For example from an interview in the case of people "… who could not visit the Laboratory …" (line 12, page 4)?

Line 2 (page 5): the Authors wrote "Pearson correlations were performed to examine associations between diet strictness levels and 1y weight change…." Please explain, if the distribution of data was assessed? Pearson's correlations are applied to normal distribution data, and data such as body mass, BMI index and scales usually do not have normal distributions.

Results:

Line 18 (page 5) and line 41 (page 5) - instead of writing "p = 0.098" and "p = 0.579" I suggests writing "p > 0.05".

Line 25 (page 5): at the first time (except abstract) the Authors use a "scores …" that have not been defined in Methods - I would like more detail on the scores were used?

Reference: The reference style is comply with the requirements except item 3 (line 38, page 8), item 5 (line 46, page 8) as well as item 8 (line 60, page 8). If the number of authors is higher than 6 should be used "et al."

33% of the references (6 with 18 items) are older than 10 years. Suggest to replace the oldest items (for example 17) with new ones.

Results:

Figure 1 and 2 - I suggest to improve the image resolution; changing the size of figures changes the resolution and readability of the data.
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