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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor and Reviewers,

We greatly appreciate the opportunity you have given us to revise our manuscript.

This manuscript has been modified and now takes into account the comment by the Reviewers. The answer to the Reviewers and the explanation for our modification are found below.

We hope that the manuscript will now meet with your approval.

Yours sincerely,

Caroline Méjean
Reviewer reports:

Reviewer #1: I thank the authors for considering my comments and responding thoughtfully. I believe that these additions have enhanced the manuscript and feel that the gap in the literature that this study fills is now clearer.

I notice that the fourth comment in my original major review (previous comment: The manuscript is generally well written however it does need a thorough read through to correct minor grammatical errors. For example, the use of 'to him' throughout the methods is not common in English and could be rephrased to be more succinct) has not been addressed by the authors. I still feel this point needs to be addressed by the authors and that a thorough proof read will benefit the manuscript prior to publication to ensure short sentences and correct English grammar are used throughout.

We are sorry for forgetting of this point. We have now rephrased these sentences throughout the manuscript by removing “to him”, as it is implicit who gets the points (lines 183-184; lines 190-191; lines 194-195; lines 197-198).

In addition, our manuscript has been reviewed and corrected by one of the co-author who is a native English speaker.

Reviewer #2: I am happy with the changes the authors have made to the manuscript, except for some minor changes needed to the wording as detailed below:

Abstract: changed to "whether or not" instead of "to whether or not be" i.e.. delete the "to" and the "be"

We have replaced ‘to whether or not be’ by ‘whether or not in the Abstract.

Methods: throughout change "him" to "them" and "he" to "they"

According to the comment of the Reviewer 1, we have now rephrased these sentences throughout the manuscript by removing “to him”, as it is implicit who gets the points (lines 183-184; lines 190-191; lines 194-195; lines 197-198).

Line 196: I think "other" needs adding to "no form of fish" to give "no other form of fish"

We have added ‘other’ to ‘no form of fish' line 194.
Lines 206, 211, 215: I think "pastries" is not a suitable word for all these foods. Perhaps "pastries and sweets" might be better.

We have replaced ‘pastries’ by ‘pastries and sweets ’ lines 205, 210, 214.

Line 290: It would be better to word this as "In addition, models using six categories of meal frequencies were produced"

We have replaced “In addition, models considering frequency of meal into 6 categories were achieved” by “In addition, models using six categories of meal frequencies were produced”, line 291.

Line 340: changed to "whether or not" instead of "to whether or not be" i.e. delete the "to" and the "be"

We have replaced ‘to whether or not be’ by ‘whether or not ’ line 340.

Line 388: "examined" instead of "considered" Line 388: "in" instead of "into"

We have replaced “considered” by “examined”, and “into” by “in” line 389.

Line 389: "likely" instead of "numerous"; Line 391: "likely" instead of "numerous"

We have replaced “numerous” by “likely”, line 390 and line 392.

Line 390: "highest occupational categories" instead of "highest categories"

We have added “occupational”, line 391.

Line 415-417: needs to be written more clearly.

As suggested, we have modified the sentence to be clearer (lines 415-419):

This last finding suggests that it might be useful to implement nutritional interventions in female manual workers and office workers. For instance, interventions that uses their social networks to enhance the socialization around healthy eating and to provide advice, such as how to use fresh
foods without investing too much time in preparation, may improve dietary intake of this population group.

Line 416: I think this should read "to socialize" instead of "socialize to"

We have replaced "socialize to" by "to enhance the socialization", line 417.

Line 525: delete "on"

We have deleted “on” line 526.

Line 528-532: Instead of "However, some inherent biases to studies based on face to face interviews may be less pronounced in self-reported questionnaires. In particular, bias associated with social desirability is lower in studies using self-reported questionnaires as self-administered tools introduces a distance between the investigator and the subject, thereby encouraging the latter to provide evaluations with the benefit of hindsight" I suggest cutting this down to:

"Bias associated with social desirability is lower in studies using self-reported questionnaires as self-administered tools, rather than face to face interviews, because it introduces distance between the investigator and the subject."

As suggested, we have modified the sentence accordingly, lines 529-532.

Line 550: I think "consistent evidence of " instead of "clear higher" might be more suitable.

We have replaced “clear higher” by “consistent evidence of”, line 550.