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**Reviewer’s report:**

Manuscript: Nutrition promotion approaches preferred by socioeconomically disadvantaged Australian adolescents: A qualitative study

I appreciate the time and effort the authors devoted to revising their manuscript. They addressed many of my concerns. However, there are still some areas that I believe could be clarified and/or explained in more detail to fully understand the study’s impact on the field. I have summarized below what I consider the remaining issues.

**Major Compulsory Revisions:**

1) I appreciate the additional text regarding successful interventions in the revised manuscript (lines 97-107); however, I am still left wondering what has been successful and what has not. The last sentence of this section (beginning with “Given the varied success…”), should follow a more thorough description of what was successful and what was not. This information would provide the context for the current study. The current text is too brief.

2) Regarding the study response rate, please provide information about how similar or different the study participants were from the student body as a whole. Were they more advantaged? Similarly, in lines 207-208, the authors indicate that the sample was relatively representative of the wider population. Please provide more details.

3) Given that the coding of the qualitative data was completed by only one researcher, please provide information as to how potential bias was overcome. Typically, I am used to seeing coding done by at least two researchers who then discuss and compile consensus coding.

4) I know that sometimes it is frustrating when reviewers have additional concerns or comments about a revised manuscript that were not in their original review; however, sometimes these issues come to light when other areas of a manuscript are tightened up and clarified. I had one such instance. In reading how much of the adolescent insight in their own health behaviors reflects the importance of parental support and the home environment, I strongly believe that this manuscript would be strengthened and would contribute more to the field if the parent data were included along with the adolescent data. The last sentence of the conclusions section confirmed this for me.

**Minor Essential Revisions:**
1) Given that disadvantaged schools were targeted but a fairly large group of student participants were not from disadvantaged homes, perhaps the title of the manuscript should reflect this emphasis. Maybe “Nutrition promotion approaches preferred by Australian adolescents attending disadvantaged schools: A qualitative study”.

2) If the interview schedule was pilot tested on two of the 22 participants, is the study n really 20? Please provide rationale for including the two pilot cases in the study n.

3) I found the section of the discussion regarding the preferred ways in which nutrition promotion message and strategies could be disseminated (lines 540-545) the most important and interesting and would suggest expanding it.

Discretionary Revisions:

1) Thank you for correcting “healthily”; however, there is still one left on line 248.
2) Are the themes described in the results section presented in terms of frequency or importance?
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