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Reviewers report:

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"

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

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

Lines 206, 211, 215: I think "pastries" is not a suitable word for all these foods. Perhaps "pastries and sweets" might be better.

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

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

Line 388: "examined" instead of "considered"

Line 388: "in" instead of "into"

Line 389: "likely" instead of "numerous"

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

Line 391: "likely" instead of "numerous"

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

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

Line 525: delete "on"

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."

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