PEER REVIEW HISTORY

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Relationship between Food Insecurity and Smoking Status among Women Living with and at Risk for HIV in the USA: A Cohort Study
AUTHORS	Sheira, Lila; Frongillo, EA; Hahn, Judith; Palar, Kartika; Riley, Elise; Wilson, Tracey; Adedimeji, Adebola; Merenstein, Daniel; Cohen, Mardge; Wentz, Eryka; Adimora, Adaora; Ofotokun, Ighovwerha; Metsch, Lisa; Turan, Janet M.; Tien, Phyllis; Weiser, Sheri

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Men, Fei The University of Alabama, Consumer Sciences
REVIEW RETURNED	11-Jul-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	The authors used the longitudinal WIHS to study the association between food insecurity and smoking among women with or at risk for HIV. Overall, this is a well-written paper with clear structures and concise language. I list below a few minor comments I hope will help strengthen the paper.
	1. "PLHIV who smoke are also 6 to 13 times more likely to die from lung cancer than from AIDS-related causes" (page 4, line 33). To put things in perspective, what is the comparable figure for people without HIV?
	2. "Given that tobacco use is the most important preventable cause of excess mortality worldwide" needs a reference (page 5, line 19).
	3. "food security status over time would be associated with smoking status" (page 5, line 28). Did you mean "change of food security status over time would be associated with change of smoking status"?
	4. How many women dropped out of the study in the middle? Were they different in any observable way from the 2553 women in your sample (page 6)?
	5. How did you handle missing values if there were any (page 7)?
	6. "assess the association between food security status and the odds of being a current smoker" (page 7, line 34). Did you mean "change in food security status and odds of becoming a current smoker"?
	7. "and food insecurity was associated with smoking intensity" (page 9, line 10). Add "positively" before "associated" for clarity.
	8. "prevalence in the sample" (page 9, line 23). Did you mean "prevalence of smoking in the sample"?
	9. The clause following "given that" (page 9, line 30) is a non sequitur to the clause before. Revise the sentence for clarity.
	10. "demographically similar controls" (page 10, line 18). I'd replace it with "similar demographic characteristics".

REVIEWER	Sholeye, Oluwafolahan Olabisi Onabanjo University
REVIEW RETURNED	16-Jul-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	The discussion needs a little revision. THE GAP this study fills, in terms of policy and programming issues, needs to be STRONGLY EMPHASIZED.

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1
Dr. Fei Men, The University of Alabama
Comments to the Author:
The authors used the longitudinal WIHS to study the association between food insecurity and smoking among women with or at risk for HIV. Overall, this is a well-written paper with clear structures and concise language. I list below a few minor comments I hope will help strengthen the paper.

1. "PLHIV who smoke are also 6 to 13 times more likely to die from lung cancer than from AIDS-related causes" (page 4, line 33). To put things in perspective, what is the comparable figure for people without HIV?

RESPONSE: This comparison is difficult, as for people living with HIV, the comparison is dying from lung cancer compared to dying from AIDS as a relative measure. For people not living with HIV, the comparison for dying from lung cancer compared to all other causes is not available as a relative measure, but rather as an absolute measure, i.e., number of deaths per 100,000. Further, that measure is not readily available disaggregated by HIV status.

2. "Given that tobacco use is the most important preventable cause of excess mortality worldwide" needs a reference (page 5, line 19).

RESPONSE: We have now added a citation.

3. "food security status over time would be associated with smoking status" (page 5, line 28). Did you mean "change of food security status over time would be associated with change of smoking status"?

RESPONSE: We have made the suggested revision.

4. How many women dropped out of the study in the middle? Were they different in any observable way from the 2553 women in your sample (page 6)?

RESPONSE: Given the longitudinal nature of the study, women could miss a visit and be present at the subsequent visit and be considered enrolled. Further, our study timeline overlapped with the latest round of recruitment, meaning that the denominator of participants was ever shifting. Thus, we have presented attendance data per recruitment wave (prior to newest recruitment wave vs. part of new recruitment), as well as median number of visits attended with a comparison to the maximum number of possible visits. We have revised the second paragraph of the Methods Data subsection to provide the additional information.

5. How did you handle missing values if there were any (page 7)?

RESPONSE: There was minimal missing data in the exposure, outcome, and covariates (<5% combined). We have added text to each corresponding section to report the amount of missingness. Specifically, we write in each corresponding section of the methods:

The HFSSM was available for 98.6% of respondents who were offered the food insecurity sub study (i.e., did not have abbreviated visits), thus no missing data approaches were taken for the exposure variable.

Complete smoking data was available for 99.5% of respondents of the food insecurity sub study module, thus no missing data approaches were taken for the outcome.

Covariate data was missing from 373 unique person-visits (3.2% of person-visits), thus no missing-data approaches were taken.

6. "assess the association between food security status and the odds of being a current smoker" (page 7, line 34). Did you mean "change in food security status and odds of becoming a current smoker"?

RESPONSE: Thank you for noticing this error. The text has been updated to now say: "Next, we used a longitudinal logistic regression model with
fixed effects for individuals to assess the association between changes
in food security status and the odds of becoming a current smoker (hypothesis 2)."

7. "and food insecurity was associated with smoking intensity" (page 9, line 10). Add "positively" before "associated" for clarity.

RESPONSE: This recommended change has been made in the manuscript.

8. "prevalence in the sample" (page 9, line 23). Did you mean "prevalence of smoking in the sample"?

RESPONSE: Yes, the omitted word has now been included.

9. The clause following "given that" (page 9, line 30) is a non sequitur to the clause before. Revise the sentence for clarity.

RESPONSE: This sentence has been revised to promote clarity. It now reads "Given that this study was predominantly composed of these populations who are simultaneously understudied among PLHIV in the US, our study fills an important gap in the smoking and PLHIV literature."

10. "demographically similar controls" (page 10, line 18). I'd replace it with "similar demographic characteristics".

RESPONSE: This suggested change has been made. The line now reads: The study included a large, geographically diverse sample of women living with HIV and women living without HIV with similar demographic characteristics."

Reviewer: 2
Dr. Oluwafolahan Sholeye, Olabisi Onabanjo University Comments to the Author:
The discussion needs a little revision. THE GAP this study fills, in terms of policy and programming issues, needs to be STRONGLY EMPHASIZED.

RESPONSE: We have expanded the last paragraph of the Discussion section to call attention to the policy and programmatic challenge.