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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the manuscript entitled "Altered eating: a definition and framework for assessment and intervention". Altered eating and the associated impacts for people with head and neck cancer and their families is an important topic however in my opinion the current manuscript is not suitable for publication at this time. The manuscript lacks a clear direction and I encourage the authors to reconsider the nature of the data they hold and the possible research questions they can answer with this data. The following are some suggested changes to guide future revisions of this manuscript:

Background: A brief review of the literature is provided however a number of important qualitative studies, which align with the nature of the data in this study, are missing from the literature review. It is suggested that the authors should include a more comprehensive review and critique of the current literature, particularly the qualitative literature, to form a stronger basis and rationale for the study. A number of existing qualitative studies have used similar methodologies and found similar findings, these studies should be addressed in the background, including their limitations, so that a clear rationale for the current study is provided. The idea of the framework for assessment is excellent and further description of how this has been used in other populations/disorders is warranted.

Methods: The qualitative methods have not been adequately described. Information is missing regarding the interviewer and their relationship to participants, the methodological orientation and theory that underpinned the study, a description of the participants (demographics), how the data was collected (was an interview guide used? If so, how was it developed?, were the interviews audio/video recorded, duration of the interview, was data saturation considered), whether transcripts were returned to participants for checking, a description of the coding process, and whether participants were able to comment on the findings.

Results: The authors describe the themes and categories as an altered eating framework. It is not clear why they have chosen to present the data in this format, given that qualitative studies usually present this information as "themes" and "sub-themes". It is not clear how this is a
framework - could the themes be used to represent a framework visually? Results are generally well presented with supporting quotations from participants to support the data. Though it is not unusual or inappropriate for a qualitative paper to integrate the results and discussion, it is difficult to follow in the current paper as there is a separate section for the discussion. This impacts on the flow and the message being presented by the authors. Consider integrating the entire discussion along with the results or separating completing to improve the flow.

Discussion: Again results are reported in the discussion which makes the flow and message of the paper difficult to follow. The "framework" which has been developed is not clear and requires revising. The discussion also lacks true integration of the findings with existing qualitative studies. Some good suggestions are made regarding possible interventions but there is a lack of integration with literature to support these suggestions. It is suggested that the authors review the current literature in self-management and strategies for adjusting to see what could potentially be applied for altered eating in head and neck cancer and make recommendations for future studies to investigate these interventions.

**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.

Unable to assess

**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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

No

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal