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Reviewer's report:

The authors addressed all reviewer comments in an appropriate and relevant way. There are only a few minor points to improve clarity.

In general authors added 5 recent papers, I was wondering if with this addition the comment of reviewer 2 to add hypothesis to the paper could have been addressed? do the new papers already give indication for hypothesis. If not, introduction is appropriate but please evaluate.

Food choice motives were assessed in 2013 but socio demographics were used from the latest available data. But is it not better to choose the data closest to food choice motives? Please clarify what was the date of demographic data and why was this chosen?

Line 201: it is still not clear what is the difference between mPNNS-GS and the PNNS-GS. I guess it excludes only the activity component but that is difficult to find out from the paragraph. This can be improved.

Table 2 educational level: a p-value is missing for meat?

Related to the answer about confounding factors (reviewer 1), it could be informative to add a figure to show how much variance was explained with the models in Table 4 (Nagelkercke)?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review? If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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