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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting paper, exploring an important construct of eating behaviors - nutrient intake and predictors of different meals. Indeed, research at the meal level has been increasing and allows us assessing the combined effect of food compounds to be translated into meaningful results, such as dietary guidelines. The manuscript is well written but overall the results section seems I little extensive. I have included some specific comments below

Background

Page 4, line 34-36: The sentence is not very clear. maybe change to "diet is composed of foods consumed in (...) and by different individuals"

Methods

Dietary assessment: what were the minimum of dietary recalls included in the study by individuals (how many did not have the 3 complete days)? Did you have participants with only one day? Did you exclude them?

If I understood correctly, the 3 24h-recalls were performed during a period of 2 years? Do you think this might representing the usual intake of the participants? Why this particular choice, as the recent recommendations are to repeat the 24h-recall within 2 weeks? This should at least be acknowledged in the discussion section

Results

Page 13, line 11: included BMI of 27.5 kg/m2

Table 1: The authors haven't tested the statistical difference between men and women, so I found it odd that they describe the results as "More men than women…"

Discussion

Page 4, lines 59-60; the sentence seems a little odd..."but they found.."
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