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Reviewer's report:

Comments to authors:

The study describes a feasibility randomised controlled trial with women treated for breast cancer (age ≥ 18 years) comparing Weight Watchers® referral plus five breast cancer-tailored dietitian led group support sessions or Weight Watchers® referral only with Control. Overall I thought that the paper was well laid out and the intervention of sound concept. I do however think that more details could be included to make the study clearer to the reader. Nevertheless, I feel that these changes are minor and would recommend publication of the manuscript once the comments presented below have been addressed.

1. The authors refer to the study as both a "feasibility" and "pilot" study/trial, the introduction section could be enhanced by the addition of some further details on the terminology used. See article: Eldridge et al. (2016) Defining Feasibility and Pilot Studies in Preparation for Randomised Controlled Trials: Development of a Conceptual Framework. PLoS ONE 11(3): e0150205.

2. The authors aimed to recruit 30 participants per arm, stating that a formal sample size calculation is was not required. Some additional details on how 30 was set would be of use (i.e. was this based on previous research in similar populations)

3. The authors state that one of the exclusion criteria was "Participated in Weight Watchers programme within the previous three months" - why was the cut-off of 3 months used?

4. Apart from the fidelity checklist for adherence to content etc. little detail is given as to how the primary outcomes were recorded (i.e. all primary outcome data (quantitative and qualitative) were documented from beginning until trial exit in the form of field notes) more details would be useful in the primary outcomes and data collection, management … sections.

5. The authors state that "other lifestyle changes such as dietary habit and physical activity" were recorded - more details on how this was done would be useful.
6. The authors elaborate on how the quantitative data was analysed but not the qualitative. Some details should be given on this.

7. In the recruitment section: "Recruitment by one researcher (RN) at one hospital breast cancer out-patient clinic took four months." Is this what was expected? Ability to successfully reach target recruitment numbers within a set time would be an interesting discussion point.

8. It is unclear what "No modification was done in the dietitian-led session contents or delivery during the course of the study" (Pg.15; Ln. 19) means.

General comments

1. Pg. 4 Ln. 20 "This article reports the feasibility of the trial procedures and the outcomes relate to participants in the feasibility trial." Should relate be related?

2. Double check the spacing before and after full stops.

3. The wording "face-to-face" and "one-to-one" is used inter-changeably, this should be consistent when referring to the same follow-up meeting.

4. Double check the quality of the figures.

5. Baseline meeting: Potential participants were invited to attend a one-to-one baseline meeting with RN at the Maggie's… Suggest putting meeting with the researcher then (RN). My first thought was that this was a one-to-one baseline meeting with a registered nutritionist.

6. Full stop missing after BRIGHT trail (Pg. 17; Ln. 15).
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