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Reviewer's report:

1. abstract ASSO needs to be spelled out in full the first time it is used in abstract this is also the case for other acronyms throughout the manuscript
2. Need to mention within abstract the the two FFQs were administered about 1 month apart
3. when talking about median intakes please express in abstract that this is in g / days

Introduction

some more recent additional references which would be useful include JADA DLW review as this gives indication of acceptability of dietary assessment tools against gold standard 2010 110 (10) 1501-1510.
Another paper you may wish to access is one which is about the quality of dietary reporting in obesity reviews 2012, 13 (12) Golley et al
A amjor limitation of this current study is that the underlying validation paper of the FFQ is unpublished, it would be worthy trying to have this published before the current paper.

Methods:

The authors needs to clearly justify why they chose to implement the FFQs only one month apart bearing in mind their developed tool has a reporting period of the previous 6 months, how does this compare with other studies please discuss / justify
at lines 73 could the FFQ items be broken down further ie fruit (x items) vegetables ( x items ) etc
Instead if listing all the items from lines 77 on wards could the authors refer to Table instead
Tables should be included in main file not as supplementary info
results many typograpical errors please have the paper proff read ie a sentence should not take up a whole line ie line 170
line 226 instead of the word considerations there needs to be mention of limitations
an additional imitation should be addressed is that the FFQs were self report measures maybe an additional reference which could be of use to justify this
could be clinical nutrition Burrows et al 2013 32 (4) who's an accurate reporter. There should also be some mention about the limitations of an FFQ tool ie overestimation etc

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

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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