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Reviewer’s report:

Major compulsory revisions:
Page 6, line 1—As this study demonstrates, more nutrient-dense diets do not necessarily have higher absolute intakes of vitamins and minerals. Elsewhere it is stated that the hypothesis was that participants with higher scores would have higher nutrient intakes, not that their diets would be more nutrient-dense. The relationship with nutrient density was a finding, but was apparently was not part of the original hypothesis.

Page 14, line 4—Change “which is comparable to” to “unlike.” The means of the 1-day and 2-day distributions are likely to be comparable, but the 85th percentile of the 2-day distribution should be expected to be lower than the 85th percentile of the 1-day distribution.

Minor essential revisions:
Page 5, line 19—Add “[5]” after “2006.”

Page 14, line 14—A more appropriate solution would be to use the distribution of long-term average or “usual” intakes to set the thresholds.

Page 4, line 15—“[6]” should be “[7].”

Page 4, line 21—“[6]” should be omitted. Perhaps reference 15 or 16 should be added.

Page 19, line 15—“Dietary Guidelines for Americans” should be “Dietary Guidelines for Americans, 2010.”

Discretionary revisions:
Page 4, line 14—It seems odd to say, “This index has been associated with dietary quality” when it is a measure of diet quality. Perhaps that statement could be omitted and reference #12 added to the previous sentence along with #11. In any case, reference #13 should be omitted because it used the original HEI, not the HEI-2005. Please consider adding the recent study by Chiuve et al. to the statement about health outcomes (Chiuve SE, Fung TT, Rimm EB, Hu FB, McCullough ML, Wang M, Stampfer MJ, Willett WC. Alternative Dietary Indices Both Strongly Predict Risk of Chronic Disease. J Nutr. 2012 Apr 18. [Epub ahead of print]).

Page 8, line 20—It would be helpful if the page number for the statement on the acceptability of fish oil supplements would be provided since this reviewer was
unable to find it.

Minor issues not for publication:
Page 8, line 8—Change “Based on consumption data of” to “In.”
Page 8, line 22—The sentence should begin with “The average daily intake of EPA and DHA from the capsules was added to…”
Page 9, line 3—“Are” should be “is.”
Page 12, line 10—Omit “reported.”
Page 12, line 11—For clarity, add “also” after “riboflavin.”
Page 12, line 18—“83.2 grams” should be “83 grams.” The data are not that precise. Please check the number of decimal places reported throughout the paper and tables.
Page 14, line 21—“Besides” should be “in addition to.”
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