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Review response

Please find below the point-by-point response to the concerns of reviewer 1.

Reviewer 1

Thank you for your valuable comments on our paper on `Consumers’ intention to use health recommendation systems to receive personalized nutrition advice.’

Major compulsory revisions:

1.) Manuscript has a rather long introduction and topic would be better served with a separate manuscript that discusses the background to the theories and hypotheses that could be then referenced in a much smaller manuscript just dealing with the survey and modeling. As it stands currently it contains too much information to be of use to the reader.

Based on your comment we have omitted less essential information about the pre-test from the paper and now only included the most crucial information to the reader. However, we also believe the background and hypotheses should not be separated from the survey and modeling. The reason is that we believe presenting them together greatly facilitates the reader’s understanding of the full story of our study. Therefore, we have decided not to separate the manuscript, which is also in line with the AEs evaluation.

2.) How representative is the sample of the total population?

We have compared our sample distribution with statistics based on the general population. Gender and age are comparable to the Dutch population. Our sample contains more respondents that completed a higher education, less people living alone and more people living in a household of three or more people. This is now mentioned in the paper.

3.) Was a sample size calculation carried out for this methodology?

Due to the nature of our research, which was largely exploratory and the fact that we were faced with a large number of different potential effects in this study, we did not carry out a sample size calculation.
4.) There is a lot of information given to the pre-test and the qual results with less space given to an example hypothetical questions posed. Even though the domains are given it would be helpful to know how these were posed.

We agree with these points. Therefore, we have shortened the section on the pre-test and added a flow chart of the structure of the task of the main study, including a hypothetical scenario of a health recommendation system. Please see the Appendix of the paper.

5.) No discussions of the limitations of this methodology in the discussion.

We have added several limitations of our methodology in the discussion section.

6.) Manuscript contains great deal of jargonistic terms. This paper would be of great benefit to those wanting to implement a health recommendation system; but paper lacks the practical conclusions.

We have now made it more specific in the discussion section of the paper how to implement a health recommendation system. Please see the discussion section for practical conclusions we have added.
Reviewer 2

Thank you for your positive and encouraging words regarding our paper on ‘Consumers’ intention to use health recommendation systems to receive personalized nutrition advice.’

No further comments were raised by reviewer 2.