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Reviewer's report:

This research describes the relative validation of an FFQ in Danish adolescents. This age group is often neglected and therefore this study is informative and of importance for researchers working in this age group, although it does not provide new methods in this area. I have a small number of points for clarification.

Methods

Line 101 are the standard portions age specific? Where do they come from?

Discussion

A little more is needed to explain why the agreement was worse than with existing work in adults and what is needed to address this. Just saying that adolescents are not good at estimating the frequency with which they consume certain foods doesn't seem to explain the whole problem.

Other relative validations report bland altman plots for agreement (eg Albar et al, 2016 BJN validation of 24hr recall and myfood24 in adolescents). What is the advantage of using de-attenuated coefficients. Perhaps include in strengths/limitations.

Other minor comments.

P38-change to 'is described in detail elsewhere..'

P81- were included

P203-quantitate is an ambiguous term
P204 - change to substantially
P219 - fewer rather than less
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