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Reviewer’s report:

This is a manuscript by Wendel et al on consumer’s intentions to receive personalised health advice, using the example of nutrition advice drawing on the psychological contract theory.

Major compulsory revisions:

1. This manuscript has a very long introduction and it is quite difficult to follow the sequence of the paper. This 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 modelling. As it stands currently it contains too much information to be of use to the reader.

2. A survey of 204 participants seems low and there is no mention of how representative this sample is of the local population?

3. Was a sample size calculation carried out for this methodology? It was not mentioned in the manuscript

4. There is too much detail on aspects of lesser importance and not enough detail on aspect of greater importance. For example - there is a lot of information given to the pre-test and the qual results (again - write these up separately?) with less space given to an example hypothetical question posed directly to the respondents would help the reader navigate this article better. Even though the domains are given it would be helpful to know how these were posed to the respondent?

5. There are no discussions of the limitations of this methodology in the discussion. This needs to be addressed.

6. This manuscript contains a great deal of jargonistic terms that anyone outside of the interest area will have difficulty reading this. This paper would be of great benefit to those wanting to implement a health recommendation system, but this paper lacks the practical conclusions to allow this to occur.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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