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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript describes a 7 week implementation of experimental nudging within a take-away outlet related to a hospital in the Netherlands. While the manuscript is generally well written there are a few areas that need to be revised in order to strengthen the reporting

* General- at times very colloquial language is used. This needs to be revised to a scientific style particularly the first paragraph.

* Title- use of the term budging multiple times in the title is not ideal as this is a lesser known approach that requires explanation. The use of social marketing approaches may be better

* Introduction- is overly lengthy and detailed. It needs to be substantially revised to create a concise overview of the main concepts addressed and their significance.

* Methods- Statistical analysis needs to be included. Daily sales data was noted and therefore statistical analysis can be conducted over the days of each week of the experiment. The present use of chi square does not provide the right outcomes for the conclusions being made

* The context of the take away story and the various other factors affecting food choice need to be added to the discussion as does the link between food choice and food consumption. They are not equal.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

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

No

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

No

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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