

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)	The Nutritionists' Health Study cohort: a web-based approach of life events, habits, and health outcomes
AUTHORS	Folchetti, Luciana; Silva, Isis; Almeida-Pititto, Bianca; Ferreira, Sandra Roberta G.

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Hsing-Yi Chang National Health Research Institutes, Taiwan
REVIEW RETURNED	03-May-2016

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This manuscript reported a protocol of data collection using website and face-to-face interviews. There were no outcome in this manuscript. There were some points of concern:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Who were the subjects of recruitment? It stated that undergraduates and graduates of the nutrition courses in Brazilian universities (lines 99-102). It was not clear whether students in the department of nutrition or those who took a course in nutrition. Then, it stated that early-life events will be asked (lines 125-236). Will the students have enough knowledge about their own birth weights, duration of breastfeeding, weight gain during childhood and adolescence, etc.? 2. Was there any quality control for the web interview? How did they know the actual person answering the question was the targeted individual? 3. What was the computer language used for the design of the web-based questionnaire? They listed many in lines 71-74. Did they use all of them or one of them? 4. The authors indicated pages 7-10 provided information on participants, variables, study sizes, etc. in the STROBE. Actually, no above mentioned information was provided in those pages. They misunderstood (or miss-interpreted) the question. My understanding was that they should describe the demographic characteristics of their participants, i.e. distribution of age, sex, social economic status, the number of participants included in the study. None of those was available.
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Orla O'Sullivan Teagasc, Ireland
REVIEW RETURNED	20-Jun-2016

GENERAL COMMENTS	The online tool described in this manuscript is a very useful one which I feel would hugely benefit large cohort studies and I feel the authors undersell the fact that having all the data entered uniformly is such a huge advantage. I do feel the manuscript would benefit
-------------------------	--

	<p>from a discussion of the disadvantages of using an internet tool; such as security issues and false reporting of information. Whilst the article is well written some sentences need to be rephrased for clarity for;</p> <p>1) abstract sentence beginning "Web-based" needs to be rewritten 2) line 39: replace is with are 3) line 75: expand on how the colors call attention to the need for increased knowledge 4) lines 157-162: if you use units for one measurement you need to include them for all measurements. Also 1st sentence is missing a word I think.</p>
--	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

To Referee #1

Dear Referee,

We appreciate the opportunity to clarify various aspects of the manuscript and to improve its quality. We re-wrote parts of the text including your pertinent suggestions. Responses to the criticisms are provided and the changes made in the new version are highlighted in yellow.

We hope to have met your expectations.

Sincerely,

Sandra R. G. Ferreira e co-authors

Comments

- “This manuscript reported a protocol of data collection using website and face-to-face interviews. There were no outcome in this manuscript. There were some points of concern: 1. Who were the subjects of recruitment? It stated that undergraduates and graduates of the nutrition courses in Brazilian universities (lines 99-102). It was not clear whether students in the department of nutrition or those who took a course in nutrition.”

Response: Thank you for the opportunity of clarifying this concern. Subjects of recruitment are of students of Nutrition colleges (= undergraduates) and graduates from Nutrition colleges (nutritionists). Please, find modifications highlighted in yellow.

- “Then, it stated that early-life events will be asked (lines 125-236). Will the students have enough knowledge about their own birth weights, duration of breastfeeding, weight gain during childhood and adolescence, etc.?”

Response: We are sorry for being unclear. We provided more details in the sections Web-based system and in the Early-life events questionnaire. Before filling the questionnaire, instructions to participants are provided recommending to ask their parents (mainly mothers) or to look at their birth registry in order to get specific information. Please, find the modifications highlighted in yellow.

- “Was there any quality control for the web interview? How did they know the actual person answering the question was the targeted individual?”

Response: As described in the section Web-based system, a prototype of e-NutriHS was created in order to test the system. Volunteers who have been working in the health area were invited to test the prototype. They did the online registration and answered to all questionnaires; to check if answers were accurate, one questionnaire per person was randomly chosen for paper responses, sent by e-mail. Based on the comparative analyses, a few script errors were detected, properly adjusted and solved.

When the volunteer clicks on the register button, alerts appear on the screen and participant should confirm that he/she is actually an undergraduate or a nutritionist. Therefore, we believe that the actual person is answering the question but this cannot be 100% guaranteed.

- “What was the computer language used for the design of the web-based questionnaire? They listed many in lines 71-74. Did they use all of them or one of them?”

Response: To program the whole web-based system all the languages were used. Each of them has its own importance to create a working dynamic Website and to adequately manage data collection and storage at the NutriHS database. Some changes were made at these lines. Please, find the modifications highlighted in yellow.

- “The authors indicated pages 7-10 provided information on participants, variables, study sizes, etc. in the STROBE. Actually, no above mentioned information was provided in those pages. They misunderstood (or miss-interpreted) the question. My understanding was that they should describe the demographic characteristics of their participants, i.e. distribution of age, sex, social economic status, the number of participants included in the study. None of those was available.”

Response: Sorry for being unclear. Excessive body weight is the major outcome for the first years of our cohort. This is being assessed using anthropometric measurements and variables obtained from dual-emission x-ray absorptiometry. Variables from the other questionnaires will be used as exposures, predictors, potential confounders, or effect modifiers. These aspects were mentioned in pages 7-10.

To Referee #2

Dear Referee,

We appreciated the opportunity to clarify aspects of the manuscript. The responses to comments are detailed below and the changes in the new version are highlighted in blue.

We hope to have met your expectations at this time.

Sincerely,

Sandra R. G. Ferreira e co-authors

Comment:

- “The online tool described in this manuscript is a very useful one which I feel would hugely benefit large cohort studies and I feel the authors undersell the fact that having all the data entered uniformly is such a huge advantage. I do feel the manuscript would benefit from a discussion of the disadvantages of using an internet tool; such as security issues and false reporting of information.”

Response: Thank you for the opportunity to emphasize advantages of the web-based system as well as disadvantages. We agree with your comments and some aspects were added in the Discussion section. Please, find the modifications highlighted in blue.

- “Abstract sentence beginning “Web-based” needs to be rewritten.”

Response: We agree with your comments related to our abstract and the sentence was rewritten. Please, find the modifications highlighted in blue.

- “line 39: replace is with are”

Response: Sorry for the mistake.

- “line 75: expand on how the colors call attention to the need for increased knowledge”

Response: We are very sorry for the senseless sentences that were rewritten. Please, find the modifications highlighted in blue.

- “lines 157-162: if you use units for one measurement you need to include them for all measurements. Also 1st sentence is missing a word I think.”

Response: Thank you for your suggestions and units were included. Please, find the modifications highlighted in blue.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Orla O'Sullivan Teagasc, Ireland
REVIEW RETURNED	02-Aug-2016

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>I feel mthe authors have addressed any of my previous comments. I would suggest one change:</p> <p>In "116 clinical examination and biological sampling. Recruitment started in March 2014 and 117 this is planned to be completed by July 2016. After a 3-year interval, they will be 118 invited to complete a similar set of questionnaires. "</p> <p>This will be published after July 2016 so the authors should know if the recruitment is complete and change the text accordingly.</p>
-------------------------	---