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REVIEWER COMMENTS FROM REPORT: 1. Overall, this is an interesting and easy-to-follow paper, but a bit lengthy, especially the Background section (7 full pages). The manuscript could be strengthened if the authors address the following issues.

2. In lieu of some paper space allocated to the Background section, as aforementioned, it would be better if the authors provide more essential information in the Methods section; for instance, some aspects of sample composition. At present, the readers are informed that the study samples were all customers who made purchases at the take-away food vendor during the seven-week study period at a large academic hospital in The Netherlands. Still, are the majority of the customers the elderly or adults? Hospital personnel or patients and their relatives? Those factors may have confounding effects on food choices of the samples. Another crucial information -- When (month and year) did the field experiment take place? I believe customers' food choices would be reasonably different between hot-summer and cold-winter days. In addition, the detailed study period information is indispensable, considering the issue of the history threat to internal validity.

3. It would be preferable, from readers' perspective, to present a table with all Chi-squared test results currently spanning over multiple pages (pp. 14-17).

4. The authors declared that "[o]ur current research has demonstrated nudging to be a low-cost and easy-to-implement 12 strategy to promote healthy food choices." (p. 20, Conclusion. And, a similar statement as the concluding remark of Abstract). Although such a declaration
seems reasonable based on the study findings, "low-cost" may be far-fetched as no cost analysis had been performed in this paper.

**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.

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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

Acceptable
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