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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer reports:

Reviewer #1: Thank you for giving me an opportunity to review this manuscript. The study described the validity of a previous questionnaire developed to assess nutritional knowledge, attitudes and practices in a Thai population. Overall, the manuscript needs a thorough revision of the English and some restructuration. I have included below some comments/suggestions.

Reply: We are grateful for comments from reviewer 1. We have taken his/her suggestions to improve our manuscript. A native English speaking has checked English thoroughly and we are confident that this will now satisfy the journal standard.

Abstract:

I think the use of the acronyms K,A (etc) is dispensable and might even be confused; considered removed it and use the full name (here and in the main manuscript).

- We have removed acronyms K,A and P and we have replaced them with full name throughout the manuscript.

I suggested deleting the sentence: "The NkAP questionnaire was developed… process", and included the information that the questionnaire was based on previous literature/expert panel. The use of exploratory factor analysis (EFA) should also be acknowledged in the abstract.
- We have removed the sentence and have added sentences to reflect the suggestions as above.

Background

Line 100: there are missing references;
- Reference is added.

"the country has undergone.." and not "as"
- Thank you, we have corrected the sentence.

Lines 101: Perhaps "these changes had led to…"

The background also needs an English revision and the addition of more reference
- We have changed the sentence and added more references.

Methods:

I suggested including some subtitles, such as, 'study design', 'questionnaire development', 'validation process' to improve clarity.
- We agree with the reviewer and have added subtitles for clarification.

Data analysis

Lines 152-155: please rephrase this sentence, it is a little confused.
- We have rephrased the sentence to make it clearer.

Lines 179: Is there any reference for this FFQ?
- A reference has been added.

Results

Suggestion for lines 187-188: "Most of participants were female (62%) + plus other relevant characteristics. I would also include the age range.

The results would also improve with some revision of English/description of results
Discussion

Lines 221-223: suggestion " …the collection of robust information on the factors that determine our …regarding food and nutrition".

- Thank you; we have modified the sentence as suggested.

Lines 225: "and evaluated the construct…"

Lines 231: NKAP

- We have modified and corrected.

Reviewer #2: The manuscript tried to evaluate the validity of a questionnaire for assessing new nutrition, knowledge, attitude, and practice of Thai population working age. Currently, many nutritional questionnaires are available about the potential correlation of nutrition, knowledge with the health of adults. In this work, a routine method was developed to characterize the changes. In which the results may provide a potential approach in characterizing the benefits and problems on to adult health and lifestyle diets. Therefore, I suggest it can be accepted after major revising.

Generally, the method in the abstract and even in the manuscript needs more details.

- We would like to thank reviewer 2 for a valuable comments and suggestions, we have go through the manuscript and revised as follows.

- We have added more details in the abstract and also further modified texts in the methodology section.

In Introduction, why you see that NKAP is the most proper questionnaire for your studied population. It shall more clarify in the introduction, not discussion (Line: 220-239).

- We have moved these sentences to an introduction.

In which, there are many other questionnaires could give a better evaluation for adulthood age. And, the objective and innovation of your study should be more discussed.

- We have added the sentence in the discussion to reflect that previous works did not report details on validation process.

In methods, the anthropometric measurements should be discussed? In which, the characteristics.
We have included BMI results in methodology and result section.

Line 97: "…populations particularly." Put "," to be "…populations, particularly.".

Thank you, we have corrected this.


Line 153-156: "Factors are correlated…..". Please, restate this paragraph and check the tense and other grammar errors.

We have rephrased the sentence to make it clearer.

Line 248, 251, 259: "construct", "number", and "final" to be "the construct", "the number", and "the final".

Line 290: "Acknowledgements" to be "Acknowledgments".

We made changes as suggested.

In conclusion: More details about your observations by showing some of this valuable study significations point by point need to be added.

Thank you for the suggestion we have covered all the points in our conclusion.

Figures: Generally, figures have many format errors that should be readjusted following Nutrition journal instructions.

We have changed our figure format according to the instructions.