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Reviewer's report:

This research has examined food items contributing to variation in antioxidant intake, among Norwegian women. The paper is well written, clear, concise and of interest. I have very few points regarding revisions to be made, so I have presented my review according to the questions posed by the journal for reviewers.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
Yes the question is well defined. However, I am still unsure as to how calculating the variation in antioxidant intake differs from calculating the main contributors of total antioxidant intakes from each of the groups (fruits, berries, vegetables, herbs, nuts, drinks). It is obvious that the authors have tried to explain this in the paper, but it is still not clear to me. Perhaps further elaboration on how this research can be used in the future would be useful and helpful to the reader to best understand this.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
The authors have used appropriate methods are and have clearly described what was done and why.

3. Are the data sound?
The data appear to be sound.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Yes.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Yes however, please refer to questions 1 and 7. Perhaps adding some references to similar studies that have been performed that have identified foods contributing most to variation in intakes of other nutrients (and how this has guided future research) would be useful.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Several limitations are stated. There is one more that could be added: the study was performed only in women; this should be mentioned. Findings may differ in
men, particularly with regard to differences in intakes of beverages, and fruit and vegetables.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
This is not obvious from the manuscript. As mentioned in question 1 above, if this work is the basis for further research involving antioxidants intakes, it may help the present paper if details are added about how this research will aid future work.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes. The paper is clear, precise, concise and well written.

Major Compulsory Revisions
Please refer to questions 1, 5, 7 above.

Minor Essential Revisions
Please refer to question 6 above.

Discretionary Revisions
Please refer to question 6 above.
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