PEER REVIEW HISTORY

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	The Alberta Pregnancy Outcomes and Nutrition Cohort (APrON) Study: Cohort Profile and Key Findings from the First Three Years
AUTHORS	Letourneau, Nicole; Ali, Elena; Aghajafari, Fariba; Bell, Rhonda; Deane, Andrea; Dewey, Deborah; Field, Catherine; Giesbrecht, Gerald; Kaplan, Bonnie; Leung, Brenda; Ntanda, Henry

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Hocher, Berthold IFLB, Nephrology
REVIEW RETURNED	13-Feb-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	This publication describes in great detail the design of a study of maternal - and also paternal - nutrition in and before pregnancy in relation to fetal health. Such a study is very valuable and important. The authors place particular emphasis on parameters of neurological development. The study design seems to be adequate for the research question. However, the reviewer does not consider it appropriate to publish this. No scientifically relevant new findings are presented, because outcomes are not available at the current time. This study should be carried out completely and then published together with all results - only this is scientifically interesting - the publication of the study design alone is not interesting for a general medical readership. The authors should consider to publication this valuable study when they have data to share - the present manuscript just contain design dat

REVIEWER	Donald, Kirsten University of Cape Town, Division of Developmental Paediatrics, Department of Paediatrics and Child Health
REVIEW RETURNED	19-Feb-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	This is a cohort profile which describes a study cohort (Alberta pregnancy outcomes and nutrition cohort study (APrON). As the study is over 10 years since initiation, this profile paper builds on previous rationale and methods papers published early on in the cohort's timeline. This kind of manuscript is challenging to write because many years of the study have already passed and data and summary of findings is to some extent a mixture of new and summary of already published data. As a result, it doesn't really feel like a cohort profile, but more a narrative description of the first 10 years of findings (very confusing changes in tenses

| | throughout). It would be easier to appreciate the project if it was presented in this way. The recruitment summary would already have been described in the original methods papers (of which there are at least three) and the age points of follow up could be presented as a figure as the authors have done in the figure and tables which illustrate the measures used. Rationale for individual choices of assessment tools/measures could be added and go into supplementary material in order to help readers understand the the approach used and reasons for this for future cohorts.

This would free up the authors to describe more fully the themes of their published findings to date and a more detailed discussion of the significance and implications of the key findings of their richly characterised cohort in an integrated way, not possible in individual papers. |
| --- | --- |

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Please note:

1. All changes have been noted in the text of the marked copy of the manuscript with red font.

2. The original first author, Dr. Elena Ali, was unable to continue to work on the manuscript, thus as discussed with the authorship team, Dr. Ali will become 2nd author and Dr. Nicole Letourneau will assume 1st author.

Reviewer Comment	Author Response
1. Upon checking, have noticed that you have a duplicate author name in the system. Kindly confirm your final author to avoid confusion. Kindly see attached for reference.	We deleted this duplicate author in the ScholarOne system.
2. Please embed the following statements to your main document just before your reference list. a. Contributorship statement b. Competing interests c. Funding d. Data sharing statement	Each of these statements has been embedded in the main document, just before the reference list.
3. Upon checking, I have noticed that your Data sharing statement in ScholarOne system is different from your main document. Kindly amend accordingly to avoid confusion. ScholarOne system : Data can be collected at the Secondary Analysis to General Evidence (SAGE) data repository or by contacting Dr. Nicole Letourneau (the principal investigator for the APrON Study). Main document : No data are available	We modified the data sharing statement within the manuscript to match as it appears within the ScholarOne system: Data may be obtained from a third party and are not publicly available and data are available upon reasonable request. Accordingly, data can be collected at the Secondary Analysis to General Evidence (SAGE) data repository or by contacting Dr. Nicole Letourneau (the principal investigator for the APrON study).

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Donald, Kirsten University of Cape Town, Division of Developmental Paediatrics, Department of Paediatrics and Child Health
REVIEW RETURNED	09-Sep-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	I am happy that the authors have addressed my concerns fully