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Reviewer's report:

This is a valuable article which provides consumption data relevant to review of national intake data in Sweden, but of interest globally. I believe that the paper is well written and I have very few corrections related to grammar or broad language suggestions. My chief concern relates to the categorisation of the legumes and more so how this is examined in terms of nutrients and then further discussed.

Specifically, the legumes included due to the botanical classification means that a range of FOODS are included. I agree with the classifications used, where soy products and peanuts are separated. These foods are consumed very differently to legumes classified as vegetables/pulses etc (which one might argue did not need separation). There is some discussion of this but it would seem that specifically for the nutrient adequacy, this requires discussion and folate is a key nutrient discussed, again, further discussion is essential of these foods sources. Some key reasons this is important:

1. soy milks - which looking at soy consumption would seem a major contributor are supplemented with Vit D, B12 and Calcium (among other things) as dairy substitutes. In many countries they cannot be called "milk" otherwise. Vit D was a key outcome possibly affected by the soy, rather than other legumes and also I think that review of calcium given the supplementation or substitution for dairy is impt.

2. legumes contain fibre, but foods like tofu and soy milks do not (negligible). Describing these differences is important given significant reference is made to poor fibre intakes in the Swedish population.

3. peanuts - are they eaten similarly to other nuts? are nut spreads of relevance and therefore is culinary use different.

The article mentions classification based on culinary use, but after the methods, there is no further reference and I believe at least a few sentences could be added to describe items such as soy milk and there relevance in Vit D and as a dairy substitute. I think describing the foods as protein sources or meat substitutes as the way individuals consume these sources is very different. Please add brief comment in the results around the food sources (eg soy milk) and possibly differentiate if these are likely to have been fortified foods (as soy milk and often vegan products (still eaten by vegetarians) are often fortified) and include in the discussion why
although countries like Aust include legumes as meat alternatives and vegetables ACTUALLY, they exclude soy and it sits in a Milk/Milk Alternatives category. Similarly comment on 2 and 3 above.

Minor items

The authors could further justify why 4 day intake is suitable and statistical modelling for both "usual intake" and "representative" data was not used.

A comment on the limited links with weigh and some legume intake is impt.

P4 Line 93, please refer to Livmedelsverket as Swedish National Food Agency, namely Livmedelsverket.

P12 lin3 283 - health conscious might be better wording

Background of abstract: This study investigated DIETARY intake and DIETARY patterns.
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