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**Reviewer’s report:**

This study has explored the reliability of the General Functioning Scale and assess the association between family functioning and the family dinner frequency. It has been shown a high internal consistency and an excellent test-retest reliability of the GFS. They have also highlighted that a poor family functioning is related to less frequent family dinner. This study is of interest in its field and I only have a few comments.

**Introduction**

Line 90: is the GFS a validated questionnaire (internal and external validation)? Please add more detail about the questionnaire.

**Methods**

Line 104: how the participants of the test-retest study were chosen (the 204 among the 440 included)?

**Discussion**

Line 207: the cross-sectional design of the study is a limitation, but how evaluate the influence of family functioning on frequency of family dinner using a prospective design?

Line 201: the social desirability bias could underestimate or overestimate the association between family functioning and frequency of family dinner?

Line 211: why data were not collected at the parental level? It is a short and quick questionnaire.

**Table 2:** There is an error in numbers of « dinner time together with parent(s) (%) » because $22.3 + 72.3 = 94.6\%$ and not 100\%.

**Table 3:** Don't use the term « multivariate » because it is adapted when you have several dependent variables such as frequency of family dinner. The term « multivariable » is adapted when you have several independent variables (which is the case in the table 3).
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