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Reviewer's report:

The authors have addressed all previous comments adequately. This study makes an important contribution to this area of research and is definitely worthy of publication. However, I still believe the quality of the delivery of the science could be improved. The manuscript requires a thorough proof read and possibly some possibly some rewording to improve ease of reading, cut out unnecessary words and generally tighten the writing style. It is important the interpretation of the results is realistic, as highlighted by the comments of the other reviewer.

I have highlighted some suggestions below but encourage the authors to spent time going through the manuscript and with a critical eye and attention to detail.

Abstract

Conclusion: “to be a possible valuable tool in...” needs rewording. Suggestion: ACARFS demonstrated sufficient accuracy for use in future studies evaluating diet quality.

Introduction

1. Diet quality is a recent dietary concept that refers to......
2. Section about the validation of diet quality indices in relation to health outcomes.... Might be better placed after the paragraph about what diet quality indexes are.

Method

1. Antropometry: Line 58: delete two weight measurements....sentence and combine with sentence on line 61 re: height.
2. Ln 61: Reword......For height and weight, two measurements were taken, and the average calculated. A third measurement was only taken when the difference......
3. Be consistent with tense in the method. Were vs are, related vs relate
4. Ln 89: Sentence “To generate.......” doesn’t make sense, is something missing.
5. Ln 99-101: Long sentence, please split into two.
6. Ln141: delete each.
7. Ln 159: The sentence “for example the recommended fat.....” seems out of
place.
8. Ln 174: tense….were found to be skewed….
9. Ln179: Consistency. Most numbers have been changed but still a few cases where >10 is spelt out eg here 13.

Results
1. BMI, age and sedentary behaviour together explain 3% of variance. Would this be considered a small or possibly even very small almost negligible amount?
2. Ln 217: In the method you refer to SEIFA. Is this the same as SEIFA, if so then use same wording.
3. Ln228-233: Could be reworded to make it easier to read.
4. Ln 245: Twelve should be 12
5. Try to be consistent with tense, past or present. Try not to switch between within a section of the manuscript.
6. Ln 253: Highest what….? Percentage not meeting the NRV.

Discussion
1. There is quite a bit of detailed repetition of the results in the discussion (eg refering to Tables). Further insight into what the result mean, comparisons with literature and implications would be more interesting to the reader.
2. Ln 273: Suggested you delete in that order as you don’t know which aspects of diet quality would be easier to change or have the greatest impact on health.
3. Ln 273: Delete Table 5. Start sentence with Our results indicate…..
4. Ln 281-284 Long sentence.
5. Ln 301 : Insert comma. With BMI, and BMI zscores had minimal…. 
6. Ln 303: too much reference to results. Possibly reword…”Although participants with the lowest ACARFS score were….
7. Ln 306: typo
8. Ln 311: delete as outlines in Table 1
9. Ln325: reword
10. Ln 341-343: Are you suggesting that using sub section of the tool is possible?
11. Ln 344: ACARFS is a scoring system which is applied to certain dietary assessment method, so suggest rewording to read ….ACARFA applied to other FFQs.

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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