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Response to Reviewers’ comments and questions

We are very grateful to the reviewers for their time and effort in reviewing our paper. We consider these very good quality reviews and the insightful comments have helped us to strengthen the paper considerably. We hoped that our revisions have addressed the reviewers’ concerns and questions. Given the extensive nature of the revision, we have not documented each change, but provided the original with track changes.

Reviewer 1.

Abstract
R1: abstract does not directly address the title of the paper
Response: We agree with this assessment and have refocused the abstract accordingly.

R1: “first sentence attributing the increasing prevalence of NCDs unilaterally to changes in the ‘global food system’ is questionable”
Response: Clarification and further evidence for this is presented in the following paragraph, which has now been integrated into the first paragraph.

Background
R1: ‘Globalisation of the food system’ (as the driver of unhealthy lifestyles) requires a citation and some clarification.
Response: Please see previous response.

R1: Changes to the food supply and global impact on health – connect this section more clearly with the broader argument of the paper.
Response: We have now made this connection more directly and provided references to support our contention.

R1: Burden of disease related to mental disorders – reviewer suggests that the placement of this section is problematic as it stands.
Response: We agree with this and have integrated it into the background paragraph.

R1: Does a food policy for NCDs address food policies for mental health? Or are different things required?
Response: This is a very good question and we have now addressed this in the manuscript in some detail by expanding and re-labeling this section.

R1: Does the title need to be reconsidered?
Response: Yes, we think so. We have now made it more relevant to the content of the paper.

R1: The section 'Food and Mental Health' be revised so that the key aspects of the research findings are clearly delineated. Ideally, it would be helpful if the food policies for mental health could be related to the specific findings.

Response: We have significantly expanded and strengthened this section with the inclusion of recently published data, reports and meta-analyses.

Reviewer 2

R2: Improve clarity and logical flow of article

Response: We agree that there was substantial room for improvement in this and we have undertaken a significant restructuring of the manuscript and argument.

R2: Provide greater evidence for stated opinions

Response: This is something we also agree with and, as above, we have now significantly expanded and strengthened this section with the inclusion of recently published data, reports and meta-analyses.

R2: Revise abstract to integrate with rest of the article (refer to nutrition and mental health)

Response: We agree with this comment and have revised the abstract as suggested.

R2: Are specific nutrition policies being recommended for the prevention of mental disorders (e.g., promotion of Mediterranean diet)?

Response: Given that the findings in this nascent area are very broad in their definition of 'healthy' diets, there are no specific recommendations that relate to this as yet. Our recommendations are similarly broad; however, they do specifically relate to mental health rather than only to general population health.

R2: 2. Clarify the bi-directional relationship between physical and mental non-communicable diseases

Response: We have included a new section addressing this important point.

R2: Include discussion of the bi-directional relationships between obesity and mental disorders (depression)

Response: See previous response.