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Authors’ Response to Reviewer’s Comment

Comment: This revised manuscript is much improved over the previous version and the authors have addressed my previous concerns. There is one minor issue remaining. On page 17, the term “estimated energy requirements” should be changed to another term such as “estimated total energy expenditure”. “Estimated energy requirements” have come to mean that energy requirements were estimated using the predictions provided in the Dietary Reference Intakes. However, the authors used a different (and acceptable) method for predicting energy requirement. To avoid misunderstanding or mix-up, any descriptive term other than “estimated energy requirements” can be used.

Response: Thank you for the clarification. “Estimated Energy Requirements” has been changed to “Estimated Total Energy Expenditure” in the manuscript.