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Reviewer's report:

The English in this manuscript is now much improved and there are just one or two tweaks to the English which are detailed below. I do still have issue with the amount of focus on correlation coefficients. Please see comments below on discussion section.

Page 15 - Lines 360-373 please discuss the width of the limits of agreement. It is this that is important not whether most of the differences lie within those limits (which they will because of the way the limits are calculated!)

Page 16 - Lines 382-383 - You state 'thus improving the accuracy of the estimates of individual intakes, as it is demonstrated by the presented results' Improved compared to what? A standard 24hr recall with no photographs? If that's the case then these data are not presented in the results.

Page 16 - Line 386 - I do not think 'observe' is the correct word. How about 'record' or 'estimate'?

Page 16 - Line 397 - change 'as' to 'an' and remove 's' from underestimations.

Page 17 - Lines 409-410 - You say significant differences were found 'due to variance within each group owing to the high variability among individual food consumption' However the variation is in the difference between two methods measuring the same thing in the same person. I think this is due individual variation in accuracy of recording of food intake/ estimation of portion size?

Page 17 - Lines - 416-445 - I note that in the results section the correlation coefficients are only briefly mentioned. I understand that previous studies have used correlations and therefore this enables comparison. A significant amount of the discussion still focuses on correlation. This is not a meaningful statistic in looking at whether two methods are in agreement. It demonstrates only that there is a relationship between the two methods which when they have been used to assess the same thing on the same day in the same person it would be quite amazing if there were not! I would suggest reducing this discussion to a paragraph at most. The discussion of the Bland Altman statistics is good.

Page 20 - Line 480 - 'which implies'....the implication is missing from the end of the sentence.
Page 21 - Line 509 - 'were under the percentage of underweight' this does not make sense - Please re-word.

Page 21 - Line 521 - Suggest replace 'between' with 'for'

Page 22 - Line 527 - Change 'maintain' to 'keep'

Page 22 - Line 531 - Change 'maintaining' to 'keeping'

Page 22 - Line 532 - Change 'in' to 'with'
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