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Thank you very much for your comments on the manuscript # NUTJ-D-17-00086R1 entitled “Relative Validity of a Web-based Food Frequency Questionnaire for Danish Adolescents”

We are very pleased to know that the manuscript potentially will be accepted for publications with the final essential revisions.

We acknowledge the issues raised by the reviewers.

We have carefully gone through the manuscript again. We hope that the editing is in accordance with the expectations. In the responses to editor and reviewers below, please, note that all line numbers refer to lines in the present. All edits are highlighted in yellow in the text.
Reviewer reports

Reviewer #1: The reviewer addressed most of the comments.

Minor issues remaining are:

Overall, please check:

English punctuation (commas in particular), as this makes the paper difficult to read in some instances.

The manuscript has been proofread and all typos and misspelling should be removed and commas should correct.

1.289: change “relay” to “rely”

Thank you, this has now been changed 1.291

1.115: if I understand correctly, please modify to: “To compare differences in estimated intake between the two methods, the median difference in percentage was calculated as the median of the following: ((FFQ-24HR)/24HR)*100

Thank you, this has now been changed to:

“To compare differences in estimated intake between the two methods the median difference in percentages was calculated according to the formula: ((FFQ - 24HR)/24HR)*100.” (1.115-116)

Therefore, in addition, we changed the wording line 145 to: “The median difference (%)” to avoid misunderstandings and keep consistency with the sentence line 150. “The median difference (%)”.

1.150: rephrase to: “we found no significant different for bread, cereals and beverages”. How come a difference of 5% is significant and one of 10% is not?

Thank you for noticing the difference in significance level between food groups in Table 2. We rerun all analysis and found that for dairy there was a mistake. The median difference for dairy between the FFQ and the 3x24HRs is not significant. This has now been corrected in all relevant
sections and Table 2. All analysis of median differences were made again and a correction for dietary fibres was found. This resulted in a correction in Table 2 from significant to non-significant median difference between the FFQ and the three 24HRs. We apologies for these mistakes. No other mistakes in the median differences were identified.

1.179-183: Please split the sentence in half and replace “although” by “:”

Thank you, “:” has now been implemented in the sentence 1.180.

1.203: misuse of “however”

Thank you. “However” has now been deleted 1.203.

1.224: please check punctuation, it is not the reviewer’s job. Replace by “798 nine-“

Thank you. We rephrased the sentence and hope the reviewer find it more clear (l.222-227):

“A relatively large intervention study among nine- to ten-year-old Danish children (n=798) reported a median (p10, p90) intake of fruits of 126 g/d (38, 244) and a median (p10, p90) intake of vegetables of 126 g/d (54, 227) measured by 7d food records [37]. The level of intake is comparable to the median (p25, p75) intake of fruits estimated with our FFQ; 126 g/d (52-247). Additionally, the Danish study showed a significantly higher consumption during school hours compared with outside school [37].”

1.221-232: hard to follow. Please change the “however” in the last sentence by “furthermore”. It is adding, not contradicting it.

Thank you. “However” has been replaced by “furthermore” 1.233

Additional revisions (besides the ones emphasised by the reviewers and editorial team):

1.27: “data” was changed to “dietary intake”
1.31: “cohort” was changed to “sub-cohort”

1.35: “the Danish National Birth Cohort” was changed to “The DNBC”

1.45: “women already in the cohort” was changed to “women already in the DNBC cohort”

1.109: “Parental educational level was retrieved from the maternal FFQ in the Diabetes and Women’s Health Study” was changed to “Parental educational level was retrieved from the maternal FFQ in the DNBC.”

1.114: “between the groups” was changed to “between the two methods”

1.132: “non-participants” has been added in a parenthesis.

1.155-158: the sentence was divided in two in order to clarify.

1.174: “those invited but who did not want to participate” was replaced with “non-participants”

1.179 and 190 “data not shown” was added to clarify

1.180-82: to clarify, the sentence “overweight children had significantly higher intake of dairy (mean difference of: 128g/d)” has been deleted and replaced with: “the mean difference between the FFQ and the 3x24HRs was significantly higher for energy from protein (1.3E%) and significantly lower for carbohydrate (-3.7E%) among overweight children compared with normal weight children”

1.306: “DNBC” was added to clarify

1.307: “In these analyses” was added to clarify

Table 1: Percentages of overweight and obese girls and boys were recalculated and numbers slightly changed to 13.7% at group level.