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**Reviewer’s report:**

Minor Essential Revisions

Perhaps Table 4 should be inserted under the Secondary Outcomes subheading (rather than right before it).

Page 20, line 539: Should “we expected the least an effect on vegetable” be written as “we expected the least effect on vegetable”?

Page 5, line 117: “to a limited extend” should be “to a limited extent”

When you talk about the average number of dietary guidelines which participants comply with (eg. Page 17, line 447), could you please include the upper and lower bound for this scale so that we have an idea of where participants fall?

Discretionary Revisions

The education variable appears to have been measured on a continuous scale (“participants had to indicate their highest attained educational level”). Thus it could be entered into the regression as a continuous variable rather than being split into high and moderate/low. I would recommend doing this as it would give you more power in the regression analysis.
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**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published
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