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PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

No - there are minor issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

No - there are minor issues

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

No - there are minor issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Could an appropriately REVISED version of this work represent a technically sound contribution?

Maybe - with major revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:
GENERAL COMMENTS: This is an interesting study to examine "health identity" stratified by BMI trajectories from childhood to adulthood.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Below are my specific comments. 1). The authors focused on work setting factors. But they also discussed socio-demographics, which seemed to be a little distracting. 2). It was smart to select participants from an existing cohort study, stratified by BMI trajectories. But the target of 50 participants (total) needs stronger justification. For example, what was the minimal sample size for each BMI trajectory to ensure their representativeness in the final results? Also, they mentioned "data saturation" as the stopping point in Results. It would be better to move it to Recruitment under Methods section, and provide detailed explanation on the criterion/definition of "the absence of new themes emerging" (e.g., how many new interviews they waited/tested in order to conclude this safely?). 3). As show in Table 1, the sample size for each BMI trajectory was about 10. This relative small sample size might not be sufficient to support the authors' discussion on proportions of various themes across different BMI trajectory categories. Also, if the authors decide to discuss the potential differences in theme distributions across the BMI trajectory categories, it is better to show key results in a table or figure so that readers can follow easily. 4). One considerable limitation for this study design is potential inverse causality, e.g., existing BMI trajectory from childhood to adulthood might shape participants' current perceptions on work-related factors. This was mainly due to the temporality issue for the study design, i.e., BMI trajectory from childhood to adulthood already happened before the interview to assess work-related factors. So, their conclusion of "Numerous work-related factors appeared to influence weight-related behaviours of participants, irrespective of BMI trajectory" might not be valid. More caution is needed when interpreting results. 5) "Health identity" seemed to a key concept for this manuscript. But it was not introduced in the Background section, or defined in the Methods section.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

None.

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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