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

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Evaluation of a novel nutrition education intervention for medical
	students from across England
AUTHORS	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

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

THE STUDY	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.
REPORTING & ETHICS	I commend the authors and hope that they will test some of their
	recommendations in future .

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

THE STUDY	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 contaced, 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 reecieve I assume they will be having a
	degree of nutritional education - this should be stated.
RESULTS & CONCLUSIONS	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

REVIEWER	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.
REVIEW RETURNED	03/01/2012

The reviewer completed the checklist but made no further comments.

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

THE STUDY	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