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COMMENTS TO THE AUTHOR

Abstract

1. Page 3, lines 26-29, background - This sentence describes how "achieving a healthy weight" could "positively impact" disease progression. Using the term "positive" here could be read as facilitating disease progression while it is contrary to the current evidence. Suggest rephrasing the sentence. Intake of balanced nutrients has many benefits, not just maintaining a healthy weight. If the word count allows authors can incorporate some of the other benefits to the abstract/ background or have a general statement justifying the need of a nutrition assessment in this specific population subgroup.

2. Suggest authors to amend the conclusion to reflect the need for standardized and validated nutrient services. Based on the comprehensive needs assessment we can see that the target population is highly satisfied with current services, majority of participants have successfully modified behaviors/outcomes and that there is a fair amount of services. Without prior evidence on the "sufficient" number/mode/type of nutrient services or the quality of perceived knowledge on nutrition among individuals, we cannot say with certainty that there is a need for more services. But there is a need for standardized services that assess long term nutritional needs.

Background

3. Page 4, lines 72-80- Minor comment- higher rates survival among prostate cancer patients may be due to improvements in early detection, slow growth rate of tumor, and current prostate cancer management procedures (not just advancements in treatment). Also suggest revising the following statement: "Due to high success rates of treatment for PC, men are more likely to die from cardiovascular or respiratory diseases, rather than from PC itself"

4. Page 4, line 78 -Minor comment- revise "diagnosis and therapy including sexual and urinary dysfunction" as "diagnosis and therapy for sexual and urinary dysfunction"
5. Page 4, lines 81-83 - Minor comment- suggest authors to consider moving this sentence on feasibility of dietary modifications/interventions to page 4, line 91 after describing the need for dietary advice.

6. Page 4, lines 84-86- add a statement to reflect how prevalent chronic diseases and unhealthy behaviors (obesity, non-adherence to alcohol intake recommendations etc.) are among persons with prostate cancer, compared to the general population or other cancer survivors. Also, clarify the relationship between ADT and chronic disease risk briefly when introducing in line 86.

7. Page 4, line 93 - Minor comment- emphasize on survival advantage and quality of life rather than just saying "benefit their health"

Methods

8. Evaluation of the PCSC Program's "Nutrition for Prostate Cancer Patients" Education Session-

Include the list of questions in the supplemental section.

9. Existing nutritional services for men with PC- Page 8, line 165- any changes to the number/quality of nutrition services after 2017? Suggest updating at least through a simple web search.

10. Scoping review-Page 8, line 172 - Authors have conducted a comprehensive literature search and commend the effort in describing the search strategy, inter-reader reliability etc. However, by limiting the search up to May 2017, authors might have missed recent articles. Suggest authors to see if there are new additions during the past year 2018 at least.

11. Page 9, line 201- suggest summarizing all findings and not limiting to significant findings of the literature review

12. Analysis Page 10, lines 210-214 - Minor comment- Authors could have used R program to conduct all statistical tests, rather than using Excel and R. Any reason why it was done this way?

13. Page 10, line 208- Minor comment- throughout the manuscript be consistent and use environmental scan or review of services.

14. Evaluation of Nutrition Education sessions -Page 10, line 223- explain briefly the realist qualitative method, the use of thematic analysis, and the statistical software utilized to conduct the thematic analysis. Same apply for the thematic analysis done for the BC health professional survey (Page 11, lines 234-235).
15. BC Health Professional Survey - Page 10, lines 228-230- give the readers an idea about the context of these questions.

Results


17. Page 12, lines 267-268 - 12% or 5% indicating a need for more nutrition services is not sufficient to say that there is an urgent need for more services. May need a justification in the discussion section.

18. Scoping Review Pages 15 and 16 - Other than the limitations/strengths reported in the reviewed articles, did the authors find additional limitations/strengths?

Discussion

19. Page 16, lines 356-358- suggest toning down the conclusive remarks as mentioned earlier in comment 2 and 17. Justify why only the results from health care professions survey was used to arrive at this conclusion.

20. Page 17, lines 361-362- discuss further how results from the scoping review suggested a need for standardized nutrition services

21. Page 18, lines 400-401 (and page 5, lines 94-95)- were there any other barriers reported in literature/surveys? As an example, barriers to implement nutrition services, transportation issues for participants etc.

22. Page 18, lines 404-405- it should be "projected" or "expected" number of cancer cases. Reference 60 does not specify the increase in prostate cancer incidence but overall cancer cases- "The average annual number of cancer cases in 2028 to 2032 is projected to be 79% higher than it was in 2003 to 2007."

23. Page 20, lines 431-432- clarify what the authors meant by "specific expertise".

Conclusion

24. Suggest revising the conclusion, see comment 2.
Supplemental Material

25. Include the survey questions from the Evaluation of the PCSC Program's "Nutrition for Prostate Cancer Patients" Education session, include tables summarizing the thematic analysis results and the flow diagram of the scoping literature review selections (comment 8).

26. Supplementary table 2: what is the unknown category? Authors specify that the health professionals were invited to provide their perspective, meaning their profession was known.

Tables and Figures

27. Table 1: Question 3 is not a yes or no response, revise the table column headings.

28. Add a summary table for the scoping review (% of studies by type, mode of delivery etc.)

References

29. There were only a few recent research articles. Consider updating the references.
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