

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on Food Intake and Food Selection Following Physical Relocation: A Scoping Review

Review, Public Health Rev

Reviewer: Mark Green

Submitted on: 10 Nov 2022

Article DOI: 10.3389/phrs.2023.1605516

### EVALUATION

#### **Q 1** Please summarize the main theme of the review.

The review looks at synthesising the evidence on how physical relocation influences dietary behaviours.

#### **Q 2** Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

See below (Q3).

#### **Q 3** Please provide your detailed review report to the authors, structured in major and minor comments.

Thank you to the authors for their paper. It is clear that they have put in a lot of hard work and I appreciate it.

It is a bit disappointing that there were only four identified reviews. Of course this is not the authors fault, but it does undermine the novelty of the review in synthesising key findings (results and discussion). There is a balance to be made in not over-describing each study or over-emphasising their findings which might be misleading when not compared to a larger number of studies (e.g., what if one is an outlier). The importance of the paper falls more into a call for greater evidence therefore – which is still relevant. There is limited value in describing the four studies otherwise. I flag that here for the Editor to consider – although I do not feel happy about criticising the authors about it as it is not their fault.

I was expecting something about the quality of evidence. While this is not a systematic review, the paper would benefit from this. Given that a lot of emphasis is placed on the four studies, it might help to reflect over their quality and what they might tell us when we have such limited range of evidence.

Physical relocation is mentioned, but the study might be better clarifying that it is about internal migration which is unclear throughout. Residential population is sometimes used, but this is not a common phrase internationally. There is a large literature on international migration and impacts on diet – some of this might have some relevance here as well.

The only other comment that I had otherwise, relates to the mechanism for how migration influences changes in diet. How do you separate out what might be the move itself, and what is the change in residential context? Some moves are associated with negative life events (e.g., divorce, ill health, loss of unemployment). I was expecting some discussion of their role here.

Minor issues:

P2 line 6 “healthful nutrition” consider using a different phrase as awkward.

P2 line 16 – provides should be past tense.

P2 line 38 – what do you mean by encouraging – what is being encouraged? May need a different term.

P3 line 36 – remove ‘however’ and start sentence with ‘less’

P5 onwards – sometimes inconsistent with referencing style – if embedding the reference in the sentence then fine to go Harvard style, but sometimes this is substituted where Vancouver referencing style would be used for other references. Suggest reviewing.

PLEASE COMMENT

**Q 4** Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

Seems appropriate to me.

**Q 5** Does this manuscript refer only to published data? (unpublished data is not allowed for Reviews)

Yes.

**Q 6** Does the manuscript cover the issue in an objective and analytical manner

Yes.

**Q 7** Was a review on the issue published in the past 12 months?

No.

**Q 8** Does the review have international or global implications?

Yes - internal migration is an important population process everywhere.

**Q 9** Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Consider revising physical relocation to internal migration.

**Q 10** Are the keywords appropriate?

Fine.

**Q 11** Is the English language of sufficient quality?

It is written to a high standard of English throughout reflecting their hard work.

**Q 12** Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

**Q 13** Quality of generalization and summary



**Q 14** Significance to the field



**Q 15** Interest to a general audience



**Q 16** → Quality of the writing



**REVISION LEVEL**

**Q 17** → Please take a decision based on your comments:

Minor revisions.