

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)	Understanding neighbourhood retail food environmental mechanisms influencing BMI in the Caribbean: a multilevel analysis from the Jamaica Health and Lifestyle Survey: a cross-sectional study
AUTHORS	Cunningham-Myrie, Colette; Younger, Novie; Theall, Katherine; Greene, Lisa-Gaye; Lyew-Ayee, Parris; Wilks, Rainford

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Mark Green University of Liverpool, UK
REVIEW RETURNED	29-Oct-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to review the following paper. The study examines whether accessibility to supermarkets and fast food outlets is associated in Jamaica. It was a pleasure to read, thank you to the authors for their hard work. The project is interesting and addresses an important area - there is a lack of research on the built environment's influence on obesity-related outcomes within low- and middle-income countries. The paper could be a useful future reference therefore. I recommend it be accepted following some minor revisions. Well done!</p> <p>The data and methods/study design seems appropriate (indeed excellent data!) for detecting whether there were any associations in the study. My only concern was over the study sample being aged 15-74 years. Commonly you would leave out younger individuals (e.g. <18 or <20) where BMI might be less relevant or individuals were still growing naturally.</p> <p>The paper is largely written well despite some minor comments (see below). Rather, I have some concerns over the framing of the overall paper and I think a fairer reflection of your study findings will help explain the interpretation of the data.</p> <p>Your results suggest some overall association for supermarkets for females only, but not fast food outlets for both males and females. Stratifying analyses by SES suggested associations were inconsistent at best. The discussion and conclusions overplays the results a little, when a more cautious researcher might be less convinced. So just toning down a little and being fairer in the discussion. For example, the lack of consistent results for fast food outlets maybe is less surprising given the inconsistency of associations demonstrated in systematic reviews. The middle class</p>
-------------------------	--

	<p>finding might be spurious given less consistent for other groups in expected directions and you have wide CIs for most estimates.</p> <p>Minor comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A lot of material has been added as supplementary materials (i.e. everything from p28-100) - I would remove a lot of this. I am not sure the need to include the entire survey as a supplementary appendix - can this be linked to elsewhere (or hosted elsewhere) - p4 - "given its association with higher intake of fruit and vegetables [8] Toronto" I think you have missed an 'in' here, but maybe reconsider the whole sentence to improve clarity - p5 - Chronic Noncommunicable Diseases (CNCDs) - often just referred to as NCDs (no C) suggest refine throughout - The environmental data - JAMNAV - what year was the data collected - Perceived community safety variable - not justified link to BMI in the paper - p10 - "1.7 kg/m² increase in mean BMI (95% CI 0.03, 0.32; P=0.020)" As you have suggested a 10% increase, the CIs do not seem to match to the 1.7 value so need adjusting
--	---

REVIEWER	Khristopher Nicholas UNC Chapel Hill, United States
REVIEW RETURNED	02-Nov-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This methodologically rigorous study is among the first to assess the role of food environments on health status (here, BMI) in a Caribbean island setting. The authors utilize a robust nationally representative demographic and health survey and geocoded food outlet dataset for corresponding areas. The use of enumeration districts as proxies for neighborhood effects is a good approach to balancing intracluster sample size needs with the need for spatially representative units. Hypotheses are clearly explained and methods are well-suited to answer the specific research questions. Authors not only assess the role of place in the geospatial analyses but further seek to disentangle the hierarchical role of place in health association studies through their use of multilevel models. These findings are important contributions for the larger food environment-health literature. If invited to submit a revision, I recommend the following updates (in order of importance):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there is a major discrepancy between the sex-specific results noted in the abstract (1:30) versus the results (10:10). The former indicates that increasing distance to supermarkets is positively associated with BMI among women and beta coefficient is 0.12. The latter indicates that (for the same sex-specific exposure-outcome relationship) increasing *proximity* to supermarkets is positively associated with BMI (B=1.2). I assume this is a mistake in the results section since the discussion and abstract both discuss the role of increasing distance as key determinants, not increasing proximity. Please rectify both the direction and magnitude of association. - Discussion: the single largest critique this reviewer has is that the authors, while taking great care in their methodological approach and statistical analysis, do not adequately develop the discussion section. In no specific order, please note the below considerations to
-------------------------	--

	<p>include in the discussion:</p> <p>[1] why 1km buffer zone? Did authors test additional distances? Is this literature based?</p> <p>[2] 12:22 no urban-rural differences found: please discuss the potential role of other food sources utilized in rural communities that is uncaptured in the environmental-level variables here. e.g. small produce plots, seasonal vegetable/fruits that supplement diets, hunting if applicable, etc. The presence/absence of supplementary food sources might reduce the relevance of supermarket proximity for rural households.</p> <p>[3] The authors do not write out what PAL is before using the acronym heavily.</p> <p>[4] 10:43 - the authors cite other studies that share the ICC of 2%+. Please further contextualize your specific findings. What does an explained variation at higher clusters (here EDs) in MLMs of 4% suggest? Is this meaningful? What might the authors suggest as next steps to further parse through neighborhood-level effects on BMI?</p> <p>[5] the authors find interesting sex-specific differences in the food environment-BMI relationship. Please discuss why this might be so. e.g. potential role of women as primary food providers.</p> <p>[6] Please discuss, at a high level, some of the challenges of capturing food environments accurately. See for example the reference below which discusses that in food environment literature the empirical food environments (e.g. GIS-based measures) are often at odds with experienced food environments. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28866989</p> <p>[7] Please consider discussing factors other than access as determined by proximity. Transportation? Food preferences? Financial access? Preferences for certain markets?</p> <p>[8] 13:40-46 - the penultimate sentence is too heavy-handed. These findings are indeed important. Yet, as the authors note, the ICC suggests that only 4% of contribution of BMI is due to ED-level effects. Please contextualize the the implications of these findings to include findings in the broader literature and not overstate the role these findings have in potential policy recommendations. The last sentence is excellent in that the authors' findings suggest interesting context-specific sex and class differences that warrant further investigation.</p> <p>- 5:22 The authors claim that none have previously studied built environment-obesity relationships in MICs using MLM and GIS-based methods. Firstly, the authors might note in-text several examples in which these have individually been done (see examples below). Secondly, the authors' argument for their methodological novelty would be strengthened greatly if they justified why it is necessary that these methods should be combined in this context. A sentence or two should do. (GIS: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21327549 MLM: https://doi.org/10.4278%2F0890-1171-21.4s.326).</p> <p>-5:36- "mediated through healthy diet": the authors are not looking at diets and neither are they conducting a mediation analysis. Please change this phrasing. Alternatively, this clause might be dropped entirely and all discussion of potential mechanisms relegated to the discussion section.</p> <p>- 6:16- "power for the proposed secondary multilevel analyses". Please expound. Contextualize power analysis. Power to detect what effect at what specified size? A single concise sentence should</p>
--	--

	<p>do. This explanation can be wrapped into the Kreft 30/30 rule and why it applies here.</p> <p>- throughout the manuscript, authors use the term "retail food-related environment(al mechanism)" (e.g. 5:29). I imagine this is to distinguish between a focus on retail food spaces versus more informal food spaces (e.g. street vendors). If so, this should be explained briefly. It is also clunky phrasing and I might suggest using a more intuitive phrase.</p> <p>- 8:53 - it would be extremely helpful for interested parties if the authors specified the page of the book reference on which the ICC greater than or equal to 2% relevance is based.</p> <p>- 7:26- it is commendable that the authors discuss time-based limitations of the household data versus food outlet data in the discussion. Please include mention of what year these respective datasets come from in their corresponding paragraphs in Measures section.</p> <p>- 7:10- Please expound on what basis the SES tertile categories based on item ownership was based. i.e. if based on the distribution of ownership, please state it explicitly.</p> <p>- 6:46 - "unhealthy diet (poor fruit and vegetable intake)": it appears as if the authors defined unhealthy diets as low consumption of fruits *or* vegetables (6:48). The "and" in line 46 is confusing, please change to "or".</p> <p>- typo page 4:25- no end of sentence punctuation or preposition before "Toronto"</p> <p>- 7:38 - typo delete "based" before "which was converted"</p>
--	---

REVIEWER	Tiffany Gary-Webb University of Pittsburgh, Graduate School of Public Health
REVIEW RETURNED	09-Dec-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>The article entitled, "Understanding neighbourhood retail food-related environmental mechanisms influencing BMI in the Caribbean: a multilevel analysis from the Jamaica Health and Lifestyle Survey" provides an important contribution to understand the relationship of the food environment and BMI in a middle-income country. While the results are not novel when compared to research in developed countries, it provides the formative work to understand food environment within the context of Jamaica. The article is thoughtful and well-written and the methods are sound. Below are a few minor suggestions to improve the manuscript:</p> <p>-throughout the manuscript the relationship with BMI in described as "increased" which implies longitudinal relationships. Perhaps the language should be changed to "higher" or "greater" to be more in line with the cross-sectional data?</p> <p>-Please provide more detail on the measures of Occupation and SES.</p>
-------------------------	--

	<p>-Please provide more discussion of sample characteristics in the community. for example there was an extremely high proportion of people who reported their communities and unsafe and this differed by sex. Further, there was an extremely high proportion of people with poor fruit & vegetable intake. Also discuss mean BMI within the context.</p> <p>-In the results and discussion the sex-specific relationships need more discussion</p>
--	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Reviewer Name: Mark Green

Institution and Country: University of Liverpool, UK

Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None

Please leave your comments for the authors below

Thank you for the opportunity to review the following paper. The study examines whether accessibility to supermarkets and fast food outlets is associated in Jamaica. It was a pleasure to read, thank you to the authors for their hard work. The project is interesting and addresses an important area - there is a lack of research on the built environment's influence on obesity-related outcomes within low- and middle-income countries. The paper could be a useful future reference therefore. I recommend it be accepted following some minor revisions. Well done!

The data and methods/study design seems appropriate (indeed excellent data!) for detecting whether there were any associations in the study. My only concern was over the study sample being aged 15-74 years. Commonly you would leave out younger individuals (e.g. <18 or <20) where BMI might be less relevant or individuals were still growing naturally.

Response: Thanks for this comment. We acknowledge that that is the usual practice but included the whole sample because of the novelty of the approach in this population and the opportunity to discover new associations.

The paper is largely written well despite some minor comments (see below). Rather, I have some concerns over the framing of the overall paper and I think a fairer reflection of your study findings will help explain the interpretation of the data.

Your results suggest some overall association for supermarkets for females only, but not fast food outlets for both males and females. Stratifying analyses by SES suggested associations were inconsistent at best. The discussion and conclusions overplays the results a little, when a more cautious researcher might be less convinced. So just toning down a little and being fairer in the discussion. For example, the lack of consistent results for fast food outlets maybe is less surprising given the inconsistency of associations demonstrated in systematic reviews. The middle class finding might be spurious given less consistent for other groups in expected directions and you have wide CIs for most estimates.

Response: We have edited the Discussion section inclusive of recommendations from other reviewers. We hope the changes are now satisfactory.

Minor comments:

- A lot of material has been added as supplementary materials (i.e. everything from p28-100) - I would remove a lot of this. I am not sure the need to include the entire survey as a supplementary appendix
- can this be linked to elsewhere (or hosted elsewhere)

Response: We followed the submission guidelines for BMJ Open that required the original protocol for the study to be uploaded as a supplementary file. Given your suggestion we have changed the designation of this file to 'Supplementary file for Editors only'

- p4 - "given its association with higher intake of fruit and vegetables [8] Toronto" I think you have missed an 'in' here, but maybe reconsider the whole sentence to improve clarity

Response: Thanks for pointing this out. We have edited the sentence by inserting the word 'in'.

- p5 - Chronic Noncommunicable Diseases (CNCDS) - often just referred to as NCDs (no C) suggest refine throughout

Response: We have edited the manuscript as suggested.

- The environmental data - JAMNAV - what year was the data collected

Response: The data were collected in 2009 and this information has been added to the revised manuscript, in the Materials and Methods section in the second paragraph under the subheading 'Environment-level measures'

- Perceived community safety variable - not justified link to BMI in the paper

Response: Thanks for pointing out this oversight. We included this covariate in our regression models as we believed it to be a potential confounder based on its association with the ability to engage in physical activity and its subsequent effect on BMI. We have edited the second paragraph under the subsection 'Individual-level measures' under the Materials and Methods section to include this additional detail.

- p10 - "1.7 kg/m² increase in mean BMI (95% CI 0.03, 0.32; P=0.020)" As you have suggested a 10% increase, the CIs do not seem to match to the 1.7 value so need adjusting

Response: We realize the way we reported this result may cause some confusion. We have edited the third sentence in the Results under the subsection 'SES- tertile-specific regression models' to state the following, "Figure 3 reveals that a kilometre increase in the distance from a supermarket was consistently associated with higher mean BMI for all models for persons within the middle class, with a 0.17 kg/m² higher mean BMI (95% CI 0.03, 0.32; P=0.020) in the final model." This can also be expressed as a 10km increase in distance from a supermarket was associated with a 1.7 kg/m² higher mean BMI.

Reviewer: 2

Reviewer Name: Khristopher Nicholas

Institution and Country: UNC Chapel Hill, United States

Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared

Please leave your comments for the authors below

This methodologically rigorous study is among the first to assess the role of food environments on health status (here, BMI) in a Caribbean island setting. The authors utilize a robust nationally representative demographic and health survey and geocoded food outlet dataset for corresponding areas. The use of enumeration districts as proxies for neighborhood effects is a good approach to balancing intracluster sample size needs with the need for spatially representative units. Hypotheses are clearly explained and methods are well-suited to answer the specific research questions. Authors not only assess the role of place in the geospatial analyses but further seek to disentangle the hierarchical role of place in health association studies through their use of multilevel models. These findings are important contributions for the larger food environment-health literature. If invited to submit a revision, I recommend the following updates (in order of importance):

- there is a major discrepancy between the sex-specific results noted in the abstract (1:30) versus the results (10:10). The former indicates that increasing distance to supermarkets is positively associated with BMI among women and beta coefficient is 0.12. The latter indicates that (for the same sex-specific exposure-outcome relationship) increasing *proximity* to supermarkets is positively associated with BMI (B=1.2). I assume this is a mistake in the results section since the discussion and abstract both discuss the role of increasing distance as key determinants, not increasing proximity. Please rectify both the direction and magnitude of association.

Response: Thanks for pointing this out. We have reworded the Results to state the following: "Figure 2 reveals that for women, in fully-adjusted models, a 10 km increase in distance from supermarkets (or further proximity) was associated with a 1.20 kg/m² higher mean BMI (95% CI 0.20 to 2.20, 0.24; P=0.036)"

- Discussion: the single largest critique this reviewer has is that the authors, while taking great care in their methodological approach and statistical analysis, do not adequately develop the discussion section. In no specific order, please note the below considerations to include in the discussion:

[1] why 1km buffer zone? Did authors test additional distances? Is this literature based?

Response: We used a 1 km buffer zone based on its use in other studies as an acceptable short walking distance. In our research presented, we only tested this distance. We have added this information to the revised manuscript, in the Materials and Methods section in the second paragraph under the subheading 'Environment-level measures' and cited the following reference: (Titheridge H, Hall P. Changing travel to work patterns in South East England. *Journal of Transport Geography*. 2006 Jan 1;14(1):60-75.)

[2] 12:22 no urban-rural differences found: please discuss the potential role of other food sources utilized in rural communities that is uncaptured in the environmental-level variables here. e.g. small produce plots, seasonal vegetable/fruits that supplement diets, hunting if applicable, etc. The presence/absence of supplementary food sources might reduce the relevance of supermarket proximity for rural households.

Response: We agree with this possible explanation for our finding of no urban-rural differences and have included this in the Discussion.

[3] The authors do not write out what PAL is before using the acronym heavily.

Response: We have explained the full meaning Physical Activity Level where it was first mentioned in the second paragraph of the Discussion section.

[4] 10:43 - the authors cite other studies that share the ICC of 2%+. Please further contextualize your specific findings. What does an explained variation at higher clusters (here EDs) in MLMs of 4% suggest? Is this meaningful? What might the authors suggest as next steps to further parse through neighborhood-level effects on BMI?

Response: Inferences regarding ICC estimates in a MLM context remain limited, but we agree that additional contextualization is helpful and thank the reviewers for pointing this out. An ICC of 4% provides the amount of variance in individual-level outcome that can be accounted for by the ED level in our case (Bryk and Raudenbush, 1992; Kreft and Leeuw, 1998). Given the lack of consistency in reporting ICCs in many multilevel studies, as well as limited discussion on inference, we have removed that in the text. Our experience both internationally and in the U.S. with neighbourhood-based multilevel studies, has demonstrated a range of ICCs for neighbourhood effects but never more than 30% and typically much lower for biological outcomes like BMI. We have further clarified this in the revised text.

[5] the authors find interesting sex-specific differences in the food environment-BMI relationship. Please discuss why this might be so. e.g. potential role of women as primary food providers.

Response: We agree that there are a number of possible underlying reasons for these interesting sex differences and have discussed this further in the revised manuscript.

[6] Please discuss, at a high level, some of the challenges of capturing food environments accurately. See for example the reference below which discusses that in food environment literature the empirical food environments (e.g. GIS-based measures) are often at odds with experienced food environments. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28866989>

Response: We appreciate this suggestion and have discussed these challenges in the penultimate paragraph of the Discussion in the revised manuscript.

[7] Please consider discussing factors other than access as determined by proximity. Transportation? Food preferences? Financial access? Preferences for certain markets?

Response: We realize there are other factors that may influence access to the food environments, which were not the focus of our research. In the third paragraph of the Discussion section we had mentioned that physical activity level (PAL), diet and motorized transport were not adjusted for in the food environment regression models and these omissions may have suppressed associations. We have edited the discussion in the revised manuscript and hope this is now satisfactory.

[8] 13:40-46 - the penultimate sentence is too heavy-handed. These findings are indeed important. Yet, as the authors note, the ICC suggests that only 4% of contribution of BMI is due to ED-level effects. Please contextualize the the implications of these findings to include findings in the broader literature and not overstate the role these findings have in potential policy recommendations. The last sentence is excellent in that the authors' findings suggest interesting context-specific sex and class differences that warrant further investigation.

Response: Thank you. We have edited this sentence in the revised manuscript.

- 5:22 The authors claim that none have previously studied built environment-obesity relationships in MICs using MLM and GIS-based methods. Firstly, the authors might note in-text several examples in which these have individually been done (see examples below). Secondly, the authors' argument for their methodological novelty would be strengthened greatly if they justified why it is necessary that these methods should be combined in this context. A sentence or two should do.

(GIS: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21327549> MLM: <https://doi.org/10.4278%2F0890-1171-21.4s.326>).

Response: Thank you for these comments. In the final paragraph of the Introduction we had made the claim that our review of the literature had not revealed any local (Jamaican) studies assessing geographical variations in obesity or other measures of adiposity such as mean BMI, using multilevel modelling (MLM) statistical techniques or Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to determine whether there are associations with the built environment in a middle-income country (MIC) context. We have edited the statement to include the Brazilian example you mentioned, as well as cited another study we conducted out of Jamaica that utilised MLM in our exploration of the association of neighbourhood characteristics and Cumulative Biological Risk, using BMI as one of the markers. The other study you mentioned by Rundle et al was a study conducted in New York City, U.S. Similar studies are still very limited in the Caribbean context and we have further clarified that in the revised text.

A combination of MLM and GIS-based methods was necessary for contextualizing the national survey data and calculating objective community exposures. This detail has been added to the final sentence of the penultimate paragraph of the Introduction.

-5:36- "mediated through healthy diet": the authors are not looking at diets and neither are they conducting a mediation analysis. Please change this phrasing. Alternatively, this clause might be dropped entirely and all discussion of potential mechanisms relegated to the discussion section.

Response: Thanks for pointing this out. We have removed the relevant phrasing from both the Introduction and Materials and Methods sections.

- 6:16- "power for the proposed secondary multilevel analyses". Please expound. Contextualize power analysis. Power to detect what effect at what specified size? A single concise sentence should do. This explanation can be wrapped into the Kreft 30/30 rule and why it applies here.

Response: We have further clarified this in the revised text, that this was power to detect a difference in BMI from 2 to 10 units at $\alpha = 0.05$ and power of 80%, with a design effect employed.

- throughout the manuscript, authors use the term "retail food-related environment(al mechanism)" (e.g. 5:29). I imagine this is to distinguish between a focus on retail food spaces versus more informal food spaces (e.g. street vendors). If so, this should be explained briefly. It is also clunky phrasing and I might suggest using a more intuitive phrase.

Response: We have simplified and changed the term to 'retail food environment' throughout the revised manuscript, including the title, as this is the more widely used term in the scientific literature. We have also clarified that informal food spaces (e.g. street vendors) are excluded from our definition, in the last paragraph under the subheading 'Environment-level measures'.

- 8:53 - it would be extremely helpful for interested parties if the authors specified the page of the book reference on which the ICC greater than or equal to 2% relevance is based.

Response: Please see comment #4 above. Given the lack of consistency in reporting ICCs in many multilevel studies, as well as limited discussion on inference, we have removed that in the text.

- 7:26- it is commendable that the authors discuss time-based limitations of the household data versus food outlet data in the discussion. Please include mention of what year these respective datasets come from in their corresponding paragraphs in Measures section.

Response: Thanks for this comment. We had mentioned that the survey (which includes the collection of household data) was done between 2007 and 2008 in the first paragraph of the Materials and Methods section. We have now added that the food outlet data were collected in 2009 in the Materials and Methods section in the second paragraph under the subheading 'Environment-level measures'.

- 7:10- Please expound on what basis the SES tertile categories based on item ownership was based. i.e. if based on the distribution of ownership, please state it explicitly.

Response: The tertile categorization was based on the distribution of ownership of a household of a maximum of 16 items. This is now explicitly stated in the revised manuscript.

- 6:46 - "unhealthy diet (poor fruit and vegetable intake)": it appears as if the authors defined unhealthy diets as low consumption of fruits *or* vegetables (6:48). The "and" in line 46 is confusing, please change to "or".

Response: This sentence has been deleted in the revised manuscript based on the previous recommendation that the clause be dropped entirely.

- typo page 4:25- no end of sentence punctuation or preposition before "Toronto"

Response: The sentence had been edited.

- 7:38 - typo delete "based" before "which was converted"

Response: The sentence had been edited.

Reviewer: 3

Reviewer Name: Tiffany Gary-Webb

Institution and Country: University of Pittsburgh, Graduate School of Public Health

Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared

Please leave your comments for the authors below

The article entitled, "Understanding neighbourhood retail food-related environmental mechanisms influencing BMI in the Caribbean: a multilevel analysis from the Jamaica Health and Lifestyle Survey" provides an important contribution to understand the relationship of the food environment and BMI in a middle-income country. While the results are not novel when compared to research in developed countries, it provides the formative work to understand food environment within the context of Jamaica. The article is thoughtful and well-written and the methods are sound. Below are a few minor suggestions to improve the manuscript:

-throughout the manuscript the relationship with BMI is described as "increased" which implies longitudinal relationships. Perhaps the language should be changed to "higher" or "greater" to be more in line with the cross-sectional data?

Response: Thanks for pointing this out. We have made the suggested changes throughout the revised manuscript.

-Please provide more detail on the measures of Occupation and SES.

Response: More details have been provided in the Measures subsection of the Materials and Methods section of the revised manuscript.

-Please provide more discussion of sample characteristics in the community. For example there was an extremely high proportion of people who reported their communities as unsafe and this differed by sex. Further, there was an extremely high proportion of people with poor fruit & vegetable intake. Also discuss mean BMI within the context.

Response: The sample characteristics that differed significantly with sex, were also included as covariates in the final models in order to minimize over or underestimation of the true strength of the associations detected between the neighbourhood food retail environment measures and BMI. We have this as a strength of our study in the Discussion section of the paper. All comments related to diet in the manuscript have been deleted, as this was not a focus of the manuscript.

-In the results and discussion the sex-specific relationships need more discussion

Response: We have expanded these areas in the revised manuscript.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Mark Green University of Liverpool, UK
REVIEW RETURNED	23-Jan-2020

GENERAL COMMENTS	The reviewer completed the checklist but made no further comments.
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Khristopher Nicholas UNC Chapel Hill, USA
REVIEW RETURNED	23-Jan-2020

GENERAL COMMENTS	The authors' revisions have provided clarity and depth to an already well thought out project. Well done!
-------------------------	---

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Reviewer Name: Mark Green

Institution and Country: University of Liverpool, UK

Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared

Please leave your comments for the authors below

I have no further comments, thank you.

Response: Thank you.

Reviewer: 2

Reviewer Name: Khristopher Nicholas

Institution and Country: UNC Chapel Hill, USA

Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared

Please leave your comments for the authors below

The authors' revisions have provided clarity and depth to an already well thought out project. Well done!

Response: Thank you.