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Reviewer's report:

Reactions to the answers of the authors are numbered according to the comments in the revision.

MAJOR compulsory revisions

1) The information on the NOP-47 is too little and it is questionable whether this will be interesting for the scientific community. The name ‘NOP-47’ is an internal name chosen by Glanbia and it does not state anything about the structure. The paper by Clare and Swaisgood gives an overview of different milk peptides, but they do provide details on the structure, eg. peptide fragment, peptide sequence, AA segment.

I strongly advise the authors to present more information on the NOP-47 to justify publication of the results.

2) We agree on the fact that the comparisons should be made between the intervention and the control. However, the comparisons in time should be deleted. The cross over design is very nice and powerful for comparisons within persons, between intervention and control. The results should be reported accordingly.

Furthermore, since there are no effects (between intervention and control) on the measures in table 3 this table can be deleted and the results can be mentioned in 1-2 sentences.

3) OK

4) conclusions, page 16 last paragraph:

“ingestion of NOP-47 enhanced vascular function in the context of minimal changes in glucose and markers of....” This should be: “...in the context of NO changes”.

“ The peptide could be of value in populations with vascular dysfunction or as a method to attenuate vascular dysfunction associated with the postprandial period....” This should be deleted because this was not tested in the study.

MINOR

5) Please explain in the paper the difference in the amount of the supplements: intervention was 5 grams, but the placebo was less. So this was not blind?
Other comments: OK
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