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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting and relevant paper. By its nature the review below will focus on the negative aspects but this area is both topical and useful and there are many positive aspects to this paper but the suggestions below are made in order to try to be constructively critical.

Suggestions for consideration and review:

Introduction

The authors might be advised to read the following papers before reviewing the Introduction. The systematic review might not have been fully published before they prepared their paper but they might find some useful information in that review. The Torres-McGeehee and Zawila papers include other questionnaires that they may wish to cite at sections in lines 83-90.


Providing the word limit allows it would be helpful to further develop the introduction and rationale a little. For example around Line 61 to give more detail on the ways in which athletes' diets are inadequate - it might help the reader to understand the context of the questionnaire better. It would be helpful to say here or later how this informed the design of the questionnaire. In terms of the 6 postulated "underlying reasons" (lines 62-66) why athletes diets are inadequate it would be helpful to give some indication of the evidence for these proposed reasons and again more on how this informed the process.

Methodology

The Methodology skips about a little. As I was reading through it I found myself asking for more detail on the "expert review" group and the format of their meetings/process only to find it later
on in with the statistics and some info then repeated again - I would advise looking again at the
sequence of the information in the Methodology. Given the importance of educational level and
socio-economic class in relation to nutritional knowledge and dietary practice/supplement usage
e tc it would be helpful toknow these factors in relation to the NONNUT group and the athletes.
If this information was not collected then obviously nothing can be done at this stage but it
would need to be acknowledged later. (Perhaps this info needs added to the questionnaire?) Were
the NONUT group recruited from within the university environment? Were the athletes all
recruited from the university environment - and hence perhaps not representative of the general
population? It would be helpful to have more information on the group ofathletes - what level of
athletes were they - what sort of sports, had they been given any nutritional training to date? -
this sort of info could be included in a table in the results.

It would be helpful to have a little more detail on the operation of the expert group as this was
the key factor that seemed to inform the structure of the questionnaire.

Results/Discussion:

Would be helpful to have a bit more detail in the Discussion on why specific questions were
omitted and modified by the expert group. Obviously every nutritionist might have their own
views on which aspects might be priorities depending on their own interest and experience it
would be helpful to have more on what informed the decisions here to help inform a decision by
the reader on how much trust they would have in this questionnaire. As one small example, to
me, looking at the questionnaire I would have liked to see a bit more on the use of supplements,
not only ones that might be deemed specific to sports. Hence it would be helpful to know more
on how decisions were made on what to include and what to modify or omit. How do the
sections retained in the questionnaire differ compared to the other questionnaires that have been
used in previous studies - that the authors presumably feel are inadequate (or they wouldn't have
done the study)? How is their questionnaire stronger than these other questionnaires and what is
the evidence for this?

In the Discussion there is little attempt to critical evaluate the limitations of the different parts of
the study. It would also be helpful to have more consideration of the data from the pilot study
and how this compares to data from other studies (See also Trakman paper noted above). Again
in considering the strength of the data generated in the pilot study it would be helpful to have
information on the type of athletes and their level.

Minor points:

In the abstract state how many athletes were included and how many NUT and NONUT.
Sentence in lines 140-145 is poorly constructed - please consider revising - maybe there is an extra word or a word missing in it.

In the Figures need to be a little clearer on how many NUT/NONNUT/Athletes are being included in the datasets. I am assuming that the "n" cited refers instead to the number of questions in the questionnaire on that aspect. In table 5 presumably "%" is % correct?
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