

## PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form ([see an example](#)) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below. Some articles will have been accepted based in part or entirely on reviews undertaken for other BMJ Group journals. These will be reproduced where possible.

### ARTICLE DETAILS

<b>TITLE (PROVISIONAL)</b>	Evaluation of a novel nutrition education intervention for medical students from across England
<b>AUTHORS</b>	Sumantra Ray, Ruzan Udumyan, Minha Rajput-Ray, Ben Thompson, Keri-Michele Lodge, Pauline Douglas, Poonam Sharma, Rachel Broughton, Sandra Smart, Rick Wilson, Steve Gillam, Mike van der Es, Ilana Fisher and Joan Gandy

### VERSION 1 - REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Dr Jacqueline Landman, Senior Teaching Fellow Human Development and Health Academic Unit, Faculty of Medicine University of Southampton England
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	25/10/2011

<b>THE STUDY</b>	The participants were selected from among medical students who volunteered and later compared with independently recruited volunteer controls. The samples may not be representative of all medical students but the study took reasonable account of this. However, it is not clear why the control group is not included in the section on recruitment as well as in Fig 1 which summarises the study design.
<b>REPORTING &amp; ETHICS</b>	I commend the authors and hope that they will test some of their recommendations in future .

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Dr Rachael Barlow Cardiff University and NHS Wales UK  No conflicts of interest declared apart from I teach medical students nutrition in Cardiff University
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	07/11/2011

<b>THE STUDY</b>	There is no mention of Ethics. It is clearly implied that by joining the intervention this is implied consent, but it would be useful to have this mentioned in the text.  The sample does not involve patients  Not clear how sample was derived, needs more explaining i.e how were the medical schools contacted, how were the medical students selected? etc. was there any opportunity for bias? how were the 100 selected out of 461 students? These are answered in the constraints, but should more detail be put
------------------	--

	in the methods section? The sample uses 4th Year medical students - how much nutrition education do they currently receive I assume they will be having a degree of nutritional education - this should be stated.
<b>RESULTS &amp; CONCLUSIONS</b>	See section above about implied consent - this should be stated in the text somewhere for clarity

### VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

The reviewer comments have been considered and changes made to the abstract, figure 1, and the recruitment section (methods). Thank you for your assistance!

### VERSION 2 – REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Dr Rachael Barlow School of Healthcare Studies Cardiff University Wales, UK  I was aware of this work and have previously discussed this work at a meeting with authors.
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	03/01/2012

The reviewer completed the checklist but made no further comments.

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Dr Jacqueline Landman Senior Teaching Fellow Human Sciences and Development Unit, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton S016 1YD
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	12/01/2012

<b>THE STUDY</b>	The study participants were volunteers so could not be representative of the population from which they were drawn. the authors note the risk of bias. however the study merits publication as a novel and more robust study than has been attempted before in the UK
------------------	---