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Author's response to reviews:

Please find here our responses to the editor's comments:

Editor: The introduction could cover the revised WHO guidelines on sugar intake which may increase the importance of the use of intense sweeteners in the future
Authors: A statement has been added.

Editor: Why was 'Embase' not included as one of the databases for the search?
Authors: Unfortunately because ANSES has no access to this paid database

Editor: Is it possible to add the full search strategy as supplementary material please?
Authors: We agree the search strategy needs to be developed. More information has been provided in the text.

Editor: The authors state: 'For this review however, only the most relevant ones have been quoted'. What do the authors mean by 'most relevant'?
Authors: This is an important point. The problem is that it is not possible to highlight all articles that has been previously selected. Therefore, we need to make a selection on the most relevant ones.

Editor: Can you assess whether there is a difference between studies for which the authors received industry funding and studies which have been funded from
non industry sources? How many of the studies considered were funded by the food industry?

Authors: this is also an important point. We have not make differences between studies and this is not clearly stated in the manuscript. However, we have looked at the proportion of studies funded by the industry. Among studies, 30.1% were funded by the industry, 56.3% by non-profit organisations, and the others do not reported funding sources. It has now been reported in the manuscript.

Editor: In the method section the authors refer to the use of the criteria of strength, consistency, temporality, coherence, experiment, plausibility, analogy and biological gradient, but they do not report on those in the results section.

Authors: once again, this is a summary of a review task of more than 350 articles and we cannot afford to spend too many sentences on full explanation. However, we have tried to make things more clear and more evidence based in the manuscript.

Editor: It would be worthwhile if a summary table of the most relevant studies could be added to the manuscript as supplementary material or at least a table of the RCTs included in the review.

Authors: We have now added a table summarizing the meta-analyses in the topic.

Editor: Discussion: References are lacking for the food surveys which the authors refer to related to the ADI.

Authors: References have been added.