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Reviewer: Judith Buttriss

Reviewer's report:
I have now read the paper and find it much improved. There are a few typos (in the new text) but apart from that I have 2 comments:

The paper has been proof-read again and typos amended.

On page 16 there is reference to Table 4 but that was not with the draft I printed.

There appears to have been an error in converting the manuscript to .pdf resulting in this table 4 being excluded from the submitted manuscript. Table 4 was added on the previous revision in response to reviewer comments regarding lack of detail on the absolute changes (ie. in grams/milligrams) occurring within individual products. It has been included in this latest revision in red text on page 36. The authors apologise for this oversight and any delays or confusion it may cause. The authors also acknowledge that this table is large and would be happy to exclude it or include it as an annex.

At the bottom of page 20 (end of para 2) a sentence has been added in response to one of my comments (For example, a decreased fat content .....)
and though I don't disagree with the sentence, it's not exactly what I was referring to. What I meant was: if say 5g of fat is removed per 100g of product, leaving 95g, as a percentage there will now be more of the remaining ingredients, e.g. sugar, when expressed per 100g without adding any more sugar to the product per se. It's the opposite of a dilution effect. Of course the energy density is likely to fall slightly if fat is removed as it's the most energy dense nutrient.

Thank you for this comment, and for clarifying. The authors agree this is a valid point worth considering in further reformulation research and policy discussion.
Reviewer's report
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Reviewer's report:
The authors have responded acceptably well to my earlier comments to their first version of the manuscript. In my view no further revisions are needed. The authors thank the reviewer for their time and valuable comments on the manuscript.

No further response indicated.
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