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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer 1

Response

1.1. The reader interested in more detailed information on the description of the collaborative care package has to get more information in other papers previously published by the authors.

Response: We acknowledge that this may be a little onerous for readers. However, a summary of the intervention components is provided in the manuscript for the reader’s convenience. Providing more detail on the intervention would be repetitive of information provided in previously published papers as well as unduly increasing the manuscript length.

1.2. A presentation of the authors’ own explanations of possible factors for the large percentage of undetected cases at follow-up would enhance the value of the discussion.

Response: The explanations from the literature of possible factors for the large percentage of undetected cases at follow-up resonates with our experience from this study. To address the
reviewers’ concerns we have added on page 21, line 398 that these findings from other studies resonate with our experience from this study.

1.3. Line 106, the sentence “Details of the collaborative care package was developed…” should be corrected.

Response: This sentence has been corrected to read as follows: “Details of the collaborative care package that was developed…” (line 113)

1.4. Line 398, the reviewer suggests that the numbering i) be withdrawn as this is not followed by ii)

Response: The numbering i) has been removed (line 398)

Reviewer 2 Response

2.1. Consider if controlling for baseline levels of food insecurity would help interpretations

Response: There was no difference in baseline levels of food insecurity between the intervention and comparison groups in the comparison group cohort study. Only demographics where significant differences between the intervention and control groups were noted were controlled for in the analyses.

2.2. Review for length and redundancy

Response: The manuscript has been reviewed for redundancy with none found.