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Reviewer's report:

This paper describes the translation and validation of a parental feeding style
questionnaire in a Chinese setting. Assessing and trying to promote healthy feeding styles
are important for public health and having validated methods for this, is crucial.
The paper is well written and easily read and gives a good description of the internal
reliability and validity of the questionnaire. I think there are ways to improve the
manuscript:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1) The aim stated in the abstract and in the main text are not the same. I would suggest
using the aim in the abstract, as that is more concrete than the general stated in the main
text.

Thank you for your comment. We have revised the aim stated in Introduction in line 107.

2) The authors spend much time on mean scores of scales by demographic variables. This
is not described in the aim of the study, and I suggest it should, or else it seems somewhat
odd in the paper as it is now.

Thank you for your comment. We decide to remove this part as we will submit another
paper addressing demographic variations.
3) The introduction should give a more thorough introduction to feeding practices and measurements used and how it is important to have valid instruments. Now the main focus is on obesity...

Thank you for your suggestion. We have revised this part in line 89-102 as below.

“The most updated systematic review has identified 71 instruments developed for measuring parenting feeding style. These feeding practices can be categorized into physical, social, cultural and political aspects. [15] Since parental feeding is a potential modifier on the association between general parenting and child weight, assessment tools of feeding practice should have close conceptual alliance with parenting style. Unfortunately, limited instruments have fulfilled this criteria except Caregiver’s Feeding Style Questionnaire (CFSQ), Infant Feeding Style Questionnaire (IFSQ), Child Feeding Questionnaire (CFQ) and Parental Feeding Style Questionnaire (PFSQ).[16] Parental control over eating is the most common dimension of four instruments (used by CFSQ, IFSQ and PFSQ). However, only PFSQ assesses instrumental, emotional and encouragement feeding, which reflects consistency, autonomy-encouraging and over-protectiveness in general parenting respectively. [16] Despite being independent of child weight,[17] instrumental and emotional feeding is associated with greater child food responsiveness.[18]”

4) I lack a thorough discussion in relation to the manuscripts aim; internal reliability and validity, and the usefulness of this questionnaire in general, and when including the given limitations. Current discussion focuses on demographics.

Thank you for your comment. The Discussion has been re-structured and revised in line 199-222.

Minor revisions:

5) How is the Wardle tool scored? What does the mean score indicate? How is the mean score in your population compared to other populations?
Thank you for your comment. We have added the description of scoring method and the meaning of scores in line 119-121. However, we decide not to compare the mean score with other populations. The reasons are the small range of mean score (1-5), and the huge variation in sample size among different studies (e.g. 214 participants for study in Turkey but 4553 in present study). It is less likely to yield comparable results.

6) Too many decimals after comma

Thank you for your comment. All the numbers are kept for 2 decimal places.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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

Thank you for your comment. We have revised the language.

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

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests.

---

**Reviewer's report**

**Title:** Chinese translation and validation of a parental feeding style questionnaire for parents of Hong Kong preschoolers

**Version:** 2 Date: 15 September 2014

**Reviewer:** Susan Carnell

**Reviewer's report:**
This is on the whole a well-organized and well-written paper. Pluses include the great response rate and large sample size, and the need for a validated Chinese instrument.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1) A better case should be made for translating the PFSQ as opposed to any other feeding instrument. In the introduction at the moment the authors largely discuss studies using other measures, which begs the question, why not translate one of those instead? Perhaps a content-related argument could be made e.g. Control scale is of particular interest in this population due to prevalent general child-rearing practices?? The authors might also help their case by referencing some studies using sub-scales from the PFSQ, e.g.

http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17228041,


Thank you for your suggestion. We have revised this part in line 87-102 as below.

“The most updated systematic review has identified 71 instruments developed for measuring parenting feeding style. These feeding practices can be categorized into physical, social, cultural and political aspects. [15] Since parental feeding is a potential modifier on the association between general parenting and child weight, assessment tools of feeding practice should have close conceptual alliance with parenting style. Unfortunately, limited instruments have fulfilled this criteria except Caregiver’s Feeding Style Questionnaire (CFSQ), Infant Feeding Style Questionnaire (IFSQ), Child Feeding Questionnaire (CFQ) and Parental Feeding Style Questionnaire (PFSQ).[16] Parental control over eating is the most common dimension of four instruments (used by CFSQ, IFSQ and PFSQ). However, only PFSQ assesses instrumental, emotional and encouragement feeding, which reflects consistency, autonomy-encouraging and over-protectiveness in general parenting respectively. [16] Despite being independent of child weight,[17] instrumental and emotional feeding is associated with greater child food responsiveness.[18] The PFSQ has been widely used [19-22] and has been translated and validated in Turkish. [23]”
2) In my opinion the demographic findings reported are substantive and merit separate reports (e.g. brief report in Appetite). The authors should consider either
a) removing some of these findings and reporting them elsewhere, b) if they have hypotheses re the demographic questions, then including testing these as a secondary aim of the study, or c) presenting a better rationale for including these analyses as part of the validation process. For example, do the authors have predictions about the outcome of the demographic analyses based on previous research such that outcomes in accordance with previous research will suggest the measure is valid? The rationale (either as validation or as a substantive question) is especially unclear for the separate analyses of maternal and paternal education so please address this.

Thank you for your suggestion. We will report the demographic variations of parental feeding practice in another paper.

Minor Essential Revisions

1) Line 96 - 'prompting and encouragement to eat' should be either 'prompting/encouragement to eat' or 'prompting or encouragement to eat'

Thank you for your comment. We have revised as suggested.

2) Line 168 - should be 'scree' not 'screen'

Thank you for your comment. We have revised as suggested.

3) Line 207 - please elaborate on 'Meanwhile, (the) gender difference may be attributed to patriarchy' - what does this mean, exactly?

Thank you for your question. We decide to remove this part as we will submit another paper addressing demographic variations.

Discretionary Revisions
1) In the discussion, the authors could make the point that this instrument will be useful not only to conduct parent feeding research within China, but also to conduct international studies comparing feeding behaviors in Chinese-speaking countries with those in other countries.

Thank you for your suggestion. We have revised the discussion (line 217-219) and conclusion (line 228-229) as suggested.

Discussion: “Our study did show that the Chinese version PFSQ is a proper instrument in this aspect and we expect the scale would be used in other Chinese-speaking population.”

Conclusion: “The validated instrument can also be conducted to compare parental feeding in Chinese population from different countries.”

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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

Thank you for your comment. We have revised the language.

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

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests.