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Dear Ms Pafitis,

Thank you for accepting our manuscript for publication in principle. As suggested, we have taken the opportunity to respond to the two discretionary comments made by the third reviewer, on behalf of the second reviewer.

1. The third reviewer asked that we respond to the second reviewer’s comment: “The authors mentioned that “an important question that remains unaddressed is whether the current prevalence of disordered eating within these groups is a stable phenomenon or has resulted from an increase in more recent times.” This study offers some insights into these issues, albeit with a regional sample.”

   We agree with the comment and have emphasized the point that we are seeking to address these issues initially with a community-based sample (which is a population based sample of South Australian adults) rather than a general population sample of Australia. The section now reads (p3., paragraph 1):

   “An important question that remains unaddressed is whether the current prevalence of disordered eating within these groups is a stable phenomenon or has resulted from an increase in more recent times. Understanding temporal shifts in the prevalence of disordered eating in a community-based sample, as well as the specific demographic sectors within which these shifts are occurring, will enable an informed and targeted approach to the design and implementation of future prevention and treatment campaigns.”

2. The third reviewer commented: “to my opinion p < 0.1 is not a statistical trend anymore. I would suggest that the authors delete the sentence describing this result as a trend. The formulation as a result approaching significance is however OK from my point of view.”
We agree, and have made the suggested amendment (p.10, paragraph 1):

“The difference between odds ratios based on residency approached but did not reach significance (z = 1.65, p = 0.10), with a non-significant greater rate of increase of extreme dieting found in the metropolitan areas.”

Yours sincerely,

The Authors