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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting piece of work but I feel that the way it is framed and the conclusions that have been drawn from it are incorrect. It is clear from the analysis that has been undertaken that there were demographic differences between the different intake groups, for example, in education and dietary preference. It is likely these factors that are driving the improvement in diet more so than the legume intake. However, the conclusions made in the manuscript indicate that it is solely the legume intake that is improving the diet. The legumes are just one component of their diet and more then likely if you looked at overall diet quality, controlled for legume intake, it would still be improved. I think the findings and conclusions need to be rewritten to put this in context properly; that legume intake is a marker of a better diet (not the sole cause).

It is not clear in the analysis which data has been controlled for vitamin supplements. Was the use of vitamin supplements compared between groups? I would guess vegetarians would be more likely to consume them. I think where it has been controlled for (and more importantly where it hasn't) needs to be more explicit in all of the sections and explored further.

The manuscript could be improved by indicating why the data was categorised into the groupings described in lines 104-106

Line 184 - please amend p&lt;0.000 to p&lt;0.0001

Line 203 - should this be p&lt;0.005?

Line 294- 296 I cannot see where the data on haem and non-haem iron is given in the results? This lower amount of non- haem iron consumed data should be shown to help support this interesting point.
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