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Review of Validation of the Comprehensive Feeding Practices Questionnaire with parents of 10-to-12-year-olds

For: BMC Medical Research Methodology

The current study assessed the validity of the CFPQ within a novel cultural context and with older children than previously examined. The large sample and thorough analytic approach are strengths of this study. As validations of feeding practice measures are scarce, this study makes a strong contribution to the literature. More detailed comments are below.

Introduction (both minor essential):

1. In general, the introduction is well-written and very clearly lays out the need for this study. There are a few awkward phases and sentences that should be revised. Notably:
   o P. 3 “The emphasis on parental control in previous feeding measures has been accompanied by less research on other important practices” The meaning is clear, but the phrasing is awkward.
   o P. 5 “In lack of validated instruments measuring a wider spectrum of feeding practices that might me more relevant for parents of older children and adolescents” Here the meaning is not completely clear.

2. The argument for validating the measure in an older sample is excellent, but the rationale for 10-12 year olds per se is less clear.

Method (all discretionary):

3. I am afraid I do not fully understand the implications of the fact that the study was conducted without ethical approval because the “individual health information included in the study (was) marginal.” This may be a cultural difference in how human subjects approval is sought and granted.

4. Were there any systematic differences (e.g., in rural vs. urban, SES) between the high responding and low responding classrooms?

5. While the removal of certain items makes sense for the target age group, it is unfortunate that this resulted in some subscales having only 1 or 2 items without new items being generated to allow for examination of these constructs.

Results:
6. Please clarify what is meant by “The Kaiser criterion suggested that 10 factors should be retained, while parallel analysis suggested 8 factors.” (p. 11) – minor

7. It is interesting that several analyses supported an overlap between the “balance and variety” and “teaching” subscales. These both appear to be authoritative feeding practices and it is conceptually satisfying to think of them together. – discretionary

Discussion (all discretionary):

8. The discussion is well written and provides very interesting “food for thought” for researchers in this area.

9. The only area in which the discussion might be expanded is the issue of the applicability of the scale to the older sample considered in this study, as this was a stated aim of the project.

10. The authors comment briefly on how cultural differences might have impacted the results. This is also a topic I could envision more discussion of (although I recognize this might be outside the scope of the paper). The lack of convergence for the item about leaving the table when full even if the family is still eating may be one such cultural difference.
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