

Reviewer's report

Title: Validity of claims made in weight management research: a narrative review of dietetic articles.

Version: 2 Date: 13 May 2010

Reviewer: Charna Gord

Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Page 8. Justification for Treatment; Prevention of diabetes. In the first sentence, I think you meant to write "common" not "comment".
2. Page 12. Top paragraph: Effectiveness: success and failure in weight loss and health improvement. I think you left out the word, "have" in the sentence, it would seem, rather, that researchers still have far to go..."
3. Page 13. Effectiveness: use of energy deficit. last paragraph, did you mean for [5] to be [J5]? That occurs twice in that paragraph.
4. Page 16. Effectiveness: scientific credibility of claims for dieting success. Half way down the top paragraph. Typo in the word 'trial', in the new phrase, "randomised controlled trial".
5. Page 17. Effectiveness: scientific credibility of claims for dieting success. Did you want to spell out the acronym, "IGT" or is that too obvious for readers?
6. Page 20. Adverse Effect. This part didn't sit quite right with me in my first reading, but this time round, I took the trouble to find and read the actual article by Barr et al, as she is such a widely respected Canadian researcher. I feel that the statement made by Aphramor in the paragraph, half way down page 20, is inaccurate and misrepresents the context and intent of Barr et al's article which is primarily comparing Canadian dietitian perspectives with the "complex and multifactorial" literature on obesity and weight management.

I strongly recommend deleting the one sentence which reads, "Barr et al [J28] conclude that agreeing with statements that weight cycling had a negative influence on health amounted to 'misconceptions'. Although Barr states that 'misconceptions may exist regarding the effects of weight cycling" she does not quite say what Aphramor suggests. I feel the quote in the first paragraph of this same section, on page 19, more accurately reflects the authors' findings. That "it is premature to make strong conclusions about effects on physical health".

7. page 24. Implications for research and practice. Last sentence of the top paragraph. I think the last sentence, beginning, "Critical perspectives..." should be made into two sentences, as it doesn't read correctly. Perhaps a period after the word "imperative" and starting a new sentence with the word "There".

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests.