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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for inviting me to review this paper, which has presented the comparative analysis of the socio-demographic and psychographic determinants of resveratrol supplement attitudes and likelihood of its adoption in two countries, US and Denmark. The choice of the substance is based on the current gap in the literature examining this plant food supplement and a broad range of (reduction of disease) health claims associated with its use.

The paper was clearly written and describes well the domain of interest. The descriptive focus however is also the article’s weakness as I was struggling to understand the broader theoretical as well as empirical implications of the study – what is the added value of the research question in the broader context of a) plant-food supplement literature and b) behavioural literature contextualised within this domain of study? For instance, there is a considerable debate in the literature about the plant food supplements sitting uncomfortably between food and medicine – what insights does the current data contribute to this issue? The authors discuss “inverse supplement hypothesis”, however beyond stating the presence of this phenomenon in the current data, have not further explored its causes and correlates.

Specifically, my comments are as follows:

Major revisions:

Methods and measures (p9-11):
1. What determined the selection of the variables to be included into the analysis – what theoretical rationale/what research question drove the analytical strategy? It reads very much as the off the shelf collection of the variables included.
2. Please give example of the items – Table 2 does that to an extent, but need further example for e.g. natural product interest.
3. How do the authors make sense of “frequency of use” – e.g. what would be the “occasional use” of the supplement, or what would be considered a “frequent use”?

The results section:
4. What type of regression analysis was used? How was the regression model developed? What values (R2 and F) were associated with what variables – please add this in the text. What was the strength of the relationship of different
DV s on the two IVs?

5. Para 2, p13: I can’t find some of the results talked about in the table:
   a. the significant results of the negative influence of natural product interest on attitudes in the US
   b. the significant results for the claim that favourable attitude towards the supplement is related to a preference for Mediterranean diet for the Danish sample (Table 4).

The Discussion section: Currently, this is to a large extent the reiteration of the results. The analysis should be contextualised within the broader literature on food plant supplements and the related issues. For instance, what is the theoretical implication of the CAM self-reported use being related to the favourable attitude to resveratrol? What does it say about the relationship between past behaviour and attitudes – how can Socio-psychological literature be brought to bear on this? What is the implication for the attitude to resveratrol the fact that both the CAM variable and the food indulgence variable are predictive of the intention to use, since the former aligns it with medicine and the latter with food? This may be further explored in the light of the inverse health hypothesis not being confirmed.

Limitations: Please describe what these might be

Minor revisions:
   a. The regression analysis is about prediction, please be careful with directionality (“In turn, a favourable attitude towards the resveratrol supplement in Denmark is related to a preference for Mediterranean kitchen”).
   b. Please refer to the tables throughout the text.

Recommendation: Major revision
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