

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Cohort profile: Pacific Islands Families (PIF) growth study, Auckland, New Zealand
AUTHORS	Rush, Elaine; Oliver, Melody; Plank, Lindsay; Taylor, Steve; Iusitini, Leon; Jalili-Moghaddam, Shabnam; Savila, Faasisila; Paterson, Janis; Tautolo, El-Shadan

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Amy Luke Loyola University Chicago USA
REVIEW RETURNED	10-Aug-2016

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This manuscript represents, essentially, a protocol paper for the adolescent follow-up of the Pacific Island Families Study. As such, there are no in-depth results presented, only superficial findings to date, and no discussion. The lack of these sections is appropriate for a protocol - or cohort description - manuscript. The guidelines for BMJ Open indicate that this type of manuscript is accepted by the journal.</p> <p>The cohort is well described and represents a vitally important segment of New Zealand's population. It is very likely important information will be obtained once the data are analyzed fully - and these results will be important for public health practitioners.</p>
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Lisa Micklesfield Senior Researcher MRC/Wits Developmental Pathways for Health Research Unit Department of Paediatrics School of Clinical Medicine University of the Witwatersrand
REVIEW RETURNED	23-Aug-2016

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>General comments</p> <p>This manuscript describes the cohort profile and details of all the measurements being completed on a 14-15 year old cohort of Pacific children from New Zealand that have been followed up regularly since birth. It just needs to be clear within the body of the manuscript that this is only a cohort profile paper with some preliminary descriptive data, and not a presentation of the results of associations that are referred to in the abstract and the introduction.</p> <p>Specific comments</p> <p>Abstract</p>
-------------------------	--

	<p>- It is not clear as to whether the 'Purpose' section of the Abstract is to present the purpose of the manuscript which is to describe the cohort and measurements completed, or the purpose of the larger study itself. As it reads now I would then expect to see the results of these associations in this manuscript (please also see my comment below with regard to the last paragraph of the Introduction);</p> <p>- Check sample sizes – there is a mis-match between the number of participants (n=931) reported in the 'Participants' section, and the size of the cohort reported in 'Findings to date' (n=934);</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>- It should be clarified at the end of the Introduction that this paper is only a cohort profile as the way that it currently reads it appears that all of these relationships are going to be investigated in this paper;</p> <p>Cohort description</p> <p>- It would be helpful to repeat sample sizes in this section, particularly with regard to the follow-up between May 2014 and July 2015, and the sample size of the nested study;</p> <p>Measurements</p> <p>- Please clarify if it was a fasted blood sample in the sub-study, and exactly what biomarkers for metabolic syndrome were measured;</p> <p>- It would be useful to include the actual Evenson cut-points in the manuscript for ease of reference.</p>
--	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Reviewer Name: Amy Luke

Institution and Country: Loyola University Chicago, USA Competing Interests: None declared.

-This manuscript represents, essentially, a protocol paper for the adolescent follow-up of the Pacific Island Families Study. As such, there are no in-depth results presented, only superficial findings to date, and no discussion. The lack of these sections is appropriate for a protocol - or cohort description - manuscript. The guidelines for BMJ Open indicate that this type of manuscript is accepted by the journal.

-The cohort is well described and represents a vitally important segment of New Zealand's population. It is very likely important information will be obtained once the data are analyzed fully - and these results will be important for public health practitioners.

We thank the reviewer for their supportive comments.

Reviewer: 2

Reviewer Name: Lisa Micklesfield

Institution and Country: Senior Researcher, MRC/Wits Developmental Pathways for Health Research Unit, Department of Paediatrics, School of Clinical Medicine, University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa.

Competing Interests: None declared

General comments

-This manuscript describes the cohort profile and details of all the measurements being completed on a 14-15 year old cohort of Pacific children from New Zealand that have been followed up regularly since birth. It just needs to be clear within the body of the manuscript that this is only a cohort profile

paper with some preliminary descriptive data, and not a presentation of the results of associations that are referred to in the abstract and the introduction.

We have revised the abstract and the Introduction to make it clear that the manuscript is a cohort profile paper with some preliminary results, not a presentation of results from the ongoing analysis.

Specific comments

Abstract

- It is not clear as to whether the 'Purpose' section of the Abstract is to present the purpose of the manuscript which is to describe the cohort and measurements completed, or the purpose of the larger study itself. As it reads now I would then expect to see the results of these associations in this manuscript (please also see my comment below with regard to the last paragraph of the Introduction);

We have revised the 'Purpose' section of the Abstract to make it clear that the aim of the manuscript is to describe a cohort and study protocol, rather than to describe the rationale for the study as a whole including its wider aims of examining associations with growth.

- Check sample sizes – there is a mis-match between the number of participants (n=931) reported in the 'Participants' section, and the size of the cohort reported in 'Findings to date' (n=934);

We have corrected the incorrect 934 figure.

Introduction

- It should be clarified at the end of the Introduction that this paper is only a cohort profile as the way that it currently reads it appears that all of these relationships are going to be investigated in this paper;

We have revised the end of the Introduction to clarify that the purpose of the manuscript is to describe the cohort and study protocol, not examine relationships between growth and other variables.

Cohort description

- It would be helpful to repeat sample sizes in this section, particularly with regard to the follow-up between May 2014 and July 2015, and the sample size of the nested study;

Sample sizes for the full study and nested sub-study have been added to the Cohort Description section as suggested by the reviewer.

Measurements

- Please clarify if it was a fasted blood sample in the sub-study, and exactly what biomarkers for metabolic syndrome were measured;
- It would be useful to include the actual Evenson cut-points in the manuscript for ease of reference.

We have clarified in the Measurements section that the sub-study blood sample was a fasted sample. We have included the Evenson cut-points in the manuscript as suggested by the reviewer.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Lisa Micklesfield University of the Witwatersrand Johannesburg South Africa
REVIEW RETURNED	20-Sep-2016

GENERAL COMMENTS	The authors have responded adequately to my comments and my suggestion is that the manuscript should be accepted for publication.
-------------------------	---