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Response to Review Comments

Please find attached our response to how we have addressed the review comments on our manuscript entitled "The Effects of Dietary Fasting on Physical Balance." In this letter, we have responded to the comments of the reviewer in sequence. The reviewer’s comments are numbered and italicized to address all issues adequately and clearly. We thank you for the opportunity to revise our manuscript. We hope it is now suitable for publication in the Nutrition Journal. My co-author and I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Shanthi Johnson, PhD, RD, FDC, FACSM
Professor & Associate Dean (Graduate Studies & Research),
Faculty of Kinesiology and Health Studies,
University of Regina
Regina, SK S4S 0A2

Reviewer #1:
I suggest some discretionary revisions:
1. Results page 14: The last sentence on this page – "The fasting condition placed additional stress on the body's ability to balance..." – is an interpretation and summary of the results regarding the postural responses, and I therefore suggest that this sentence is moved to the discussion section.
Response: Done.

2. Table 3: What does the percent indicate? Percent of subjects with the respective postural response? Please clarify. Also, as the authors state that there were differences in postural response between the fasting and non-fasting conditions, and an increase in postural response with increasing difficulty of the test situation, p-values should be given in the Table.
Response: Yes, the percentage refers to the specific postural response. This has been clarified in the title of Table 3. Given the nature of the data and frequency distribution across the specific postural responses, no statistical comparisons were made. The observed differences in frequencies are reported in the Table.

Reviewer #2:

This paper is greatly improved after the authors have made the necessary changes, corrections etc. I have found only three (3) typographical/grammatical minor errors which should be corrected before the paper is published. These are as follows:
 a) p.16-line 7: reported is redundant in the sentence
 b) p.17-3 lines from the bottom: raise not raises
 c) p.17 lines 1-3 from the bottom and the first line on p.18: this is not a sentence (could easily remove whether to correct)
Response: Done.