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Rate of and Factors Associated with breakfast among Inner Mongolia Medical Students in China
Juan Sun1§, He Yi1, Zhiyue Liu1, Jiang Bian1, Yuki Eshita2, Gaimei Li3 Qing Zhang1#
Haiying Jia1

When assessing the work, please consider the following points:
1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
3. Are the data sound?
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
9. Is the writing acceptable?

1. The question, defined as a Title and also in the Aim of the paper use the term “rate of” which confuse me because in results there is no rate (meaning prevalence rate). Probably would be better to say prevalence or point of prevalence…

2. Methods are well described but appropriate only if the relevant parts in text will be changed (title, aim, discussion).

3. Yes.
4. Yes.

5. Yes and No - because of possible misunderstanding of using “rate of” in text, and also I did not like the term “breakfast behavior” in some part of the text – if you would like to use it you should write it as italic or with quotation marks.
6. Not sure – how could biomedical measurements be helpful in assessing breakfast consumption related behavior? You can state e.g. a response bias on few questions (because of using self-administered questionnaire).

7. Not sure – see the paragraph 5 in Introduction where stated “Many studies of breakfast consumption were carried out in the 1980s by different research groups to examine the type of food consumed around the world [14].” – with only one reference from 1989, but what about next decades researches?

8. Title - no (see the number 1 in this review); in Abstract the aim and methods are not well presented (see suggestions section)


I declare no competing interests.

Suggestions:

A/ Title – should be changed for better intelligibility

Factors Associated with skipping breakfast among …… or

Prevalence in breakfast consumption and related habits (or factors) among….

B/ In text

– change the demographic characteristics or supplement with lifestyle habits (or something similar) where they are described (in Conclusion especially);
– results are inconsistently specified in Abstract conclusion and final conclusion: make them pursuant to the results showed in Table 3. and Table 4.
– emphasize when you are talking about skipping breakfast and when about breakfast consumption in relation to statistically significant related factors;
– use terms like: breakfast consumption habit or regularly consumed breakfast or skipping breakfast instead of “breakfast behavior”
– in Methods there is statement that breakfast habit was described in relation to demographic characteristic which is not the only most relevant result

e.g. Abstract, section Methods:

“We describe the rate of having breakfast in relation to demographic characteristics. Factors associated with breakfast were identified using multiple logistic regression analysis.”

Suggestion:

We calculated prevalence of skipping breakfast in relation to demographic characteristics and some lifestyle habits. Factors associated with skipping breakfast ……

C/ The data are interesting and sound so the paper must “follow” them in order to give best insight.

D/ The subject are relevant and important and improvement of paper will give
better intelligibility in what authors intended to say.

E/ I would like authors to rewrite methodology description (e.g. instead of “rate” use “prevalence”) and other sections where “rate” was use instead of “prevalence” in order to avoid misinterpretation because they actually showed the point-prevalence.

Also, I am not sure that the reference 17 (which is the previous paper of the almost same authors) belongs in this section. Write the whole methodology (even if it is used in previous paper) because probably it is not “the commonly known” methodology.

F/ If there is a need for referring to your previous paper it will be better to refer on it in section Discussion.

G/ Improve English in whole text.

H/ Consider to rewrite some of Table titles e.g.

Table 1. Breakfast consumption prevalence among students according to demographic characteristics

Table 2. Students' self-perception of breakfast consumption associated factors

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.