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Reviewer's report:

The authors report the qualitative results of a pilot randomised controlled trial comparing a 12-week dietary program that included weekly telephone counselling from a registered dietitian nutritionist (control) or weekly telephone counselling plus specific goals for vegetable consumption (intervention). Participants' program preferences and feedback were collected. This research is important as it lays the foundation for building future dietary interventions for people with head and neck cancer. The paper was well written and clear. There are a few clarifications that should be addressed:

Major comments:

* Since the two groups received slightly different programs, it would seem important to compare program preferences between groups, either in writing or in a table. If there are no differences, then combining the data is appropriate.

Section "Study and intervention (program) evaluation" (Lines 202-212)

* It is stated in the methods that "somewhat agree" and "strongly agree" were collapsed into one category and "neutral", "somewhat disagree" and "strongly disagree" were collapsed into another. Please provide labels for these new categories and present the results using those new categories. Also, for clarity, please state the number of participants agreeing or disagreeing with each question or state in a table.

Minor comments:

* In general, throughout the results, if the number of respondents is presented, also note the percentage (if not stated in a table).
In the future, "double barreled" survey questions should be avoided. For example, the question "the study staff was helpful and easy to contact", should be divided into "the study staff was helpful" and "the study staff was easy to contact", as these are different concepts. The study staff could have been helpful but not easy to contact or vice versa.
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