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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Drs. Collins and Kirkpatrick,

I am writing on behalf of all the authors of the manuscript “Utility of eButton images for identifying food preparation behaviors and meal-related tasks in adolescents.” ID (NUTJ-D-17-00304).

Thank you for the further reviewer comments on this manuscript. We were pleased you found our article acceptable for publication. We wish to especially thank the reviewers for their comments, which we recognize took time and effort. We have addressed each most recent reviewer comment as listed below:
Reviewer #1:

1. Line 173-174 I would suggest re-wording to say something like "Adolescents who were classified as demonstrating any of these behaviours were deemed to have demonstrated cooking skills and food preparation habits"

Line 173 – 174: Change has been made as suggested

2. Line 223-224 - The new sentence "Regardless of number of demonstrations, each behavior was coded once." is unclear suggest re-wording to say "Each behaviour was coded as either exhibited or not exhibited, regardless of the number of times the behaviour was demonstrated"

Line 223-224: Change has been made as suggested

3. Line 251-253 - The new sentence is unclear suggest re-wording to say "Participants were frequently seen to be browsing for food around their homes, but were less frequently seen to actually prepare foods for cooking or cook foods themselves."

Lines 252 – 254: Change has been made as suggested

4. Line 320-321 - States "Food advertisement exposure, for example, was not commonly seen in the sample, potentially due to the downward angle of the camera." I'm unclear why the camera would be able to detect that the participant was viewing a food related TV programme or looking at a food related website but not capture exposure to food advertisements. Please clarify.
Line 320- 324: Additional clarification has been added.

Reviewer #2

5. Line 174 states that 'Classifying these behaviors identified the adolescents' demonstrated skills and food preparation habits'. I still feel strongly that you cannot infer much about skills and habits from this one day observation where children were not actually asked to prepare anything. Please rephrase.

Line 173 – 174: Change has been made as suggested

6. Line 272 'Most participants only helped with grocery shopping a maximum of one time per week (82.2%)' - this needs to be rephrased to make clear that this refers to a previous study.

Line 272-274: Clarification has been added.

7. The primary weakness of this study is that it in some places purports to be demonstrating a better method than self/parent report questionnaires, but does not actually have the data to support that, particularly given that the coding is presence/absence of behavior rather than frequency. Whilst the authors have added a sentence (line 314) acknowledging they don't have an alternative method with which to compare, they have not expanded upon why this is a limitation. This requires further expansion/discussion.

Lines 315 – 318: Limitation section has been expanded.
Please contact me with any further questions or concerns related to these revisions. Thank you for your further consideration of this manuscript.

Sincerely,

Margaret Raber, MPH