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Reviewer's report:

The study is an important investigation aiming at identifying specific nutritional needs of prostate cancer (PC) patients in British Columbia (Canada). The study was conducted using a multi-faceted (sic) strategy, including a systematic literature review, that provides professionals and stakeholders with insightful data on the knowledge, needs and satisfaction of PC patients regarding existing nutritional services available to them in their area. Also, it emphasizes the lack of sufficient dietitians to cover the needs of all of these patients.

As a minor comment, it would be interesting to stratify results (table 1 and maybe sorting the references selected through the literature review) by Gleason score of participants, as the specific dietary needs and efficacy of nutritional or lifestyle interventions could vary according to the severity of the disease. Do the authors have information on the stage/grade of PC of selected cases to allow for comparisons according to GS?

An additional comment is the manuscript provides little information about the search strategy made through online web browsers. Including the search chain indicated in the manuscript gives over 7 million results in Google (plus near 23 million results in Bing and Yahoo). Have the authors used additional filters to refine the search? Have web browsers other than Google been considered? Any additional information on this would be appreciated.

Otherwise, the manuscript is well-written and discussed, and, apart from some typos (e.g. 'dietician') and the use of an old version of R (version 3.6 is available, whereas the use of two programs, Excel and R, to compute very basic statistics that could all be run in the same package denotes little statistical skills), I have no further comments.
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