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Dear editors,

Please find the changes / reaction in blue below. Thank you!

Ethics statement:

Research involving human subjects (including human material or human data) that is reported in the manuscript must have been performed with the approval of an appropriate ethics committee and be in compliance with the Helsinki Declaration (http://www.wma.net/en/30publications/10policies/b3/index.html). A statement to this effect must appear in the Methods section of the manuscript, including the name of the body which gave approval, with a reference number where appropriate. If a study has been granted an exemption from requiring ethics approval, this should also be detailed in the manuscript (including the name of the ethics committee that granted the exemption).

In Denmark the research approaches that we apply in social sciences do not require pre-approval by ethical committees. Therefore, no ethics committee has given approval. However, as a research group we have imposed ourselves to follow ethical guidelines, and these are in compliance with the Helsinki Declaration. Please find the document uploaded.

- Formal consent statement

Please state in the Methods section whether written informed consent for participation in the study was obtained from participants or, where participants are children, a parent or guardian.

We added the following sentence to the methods section:

“Only adult respondents were included. An introductory text explained the aim, the anonymous, confidential and non-commercial use of the study for research purposes only and what the survey consisted of, and provided a contact person for any further questions. Proceeding to fill out the online survey after this step was assumed to equal written consent; a withdrawal from the survey was possible at all stages during the survey. The research followed the ethical principles as outlined by the Helsinki declaration and further explained in the research group’s ethical guidelines.” The introduction was the same in the US, e.g. it was referred to MAPP as the institution behind the survey.

We have moved the paragraph “A limitation of the study is that the cross-sectional nature of the data does not allow for understanding developments over time with regard to this issue. While the panel was representative, our screening for supplement use, and the quota sampling of respondents, mean that the sample was not representative of the US or Danish population.” from the end of the conclusion to the end of the discussion, as you had suggested.