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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting paper with clear objectives and conclusions. However it is currently a difficult manuscript to get through as the methods are far too detailed, and the results and discussion are not written concisely. This probably reflects the fact that the work is based on a masters project, so it needs to be re-written appropriately for a scientific journal.

Major comments:

1) The methods need to be rewritten to make them accessible to a non-statistician. I appreciate that the modelling is complex, so would suggest a clear overview is given within the text, then enough detail for the work to be replicated is given as supplementary material

2) The results and discussion sections need to be made more concise, e.g. lines 345-53 (re Table 2) and lines 365-93 (re Table 3) in the results, and the limitation of simulation by age strata which is mentioned twice in the discussion

3) All decisions made need to be justified, e.g. why was the SPADE modelling option chosen in preference to others? / line 198 “for the simulation purpose it was chosen to only to model the intake amounts in function of age”?

4) Figure 1 needs more thought as it is confusing to have all four simulations on the same plot e.g. within simulation comparison of with/without FFQ is not possible. Also more labelling is needed i.e. the y axes and what A-C refer to

5) When reference 6 is mentioned in the discussion it is a bit of a surprise that work that is so similar has been undertaken before (even though it is a report rather than a published paper) - the similarities and differences between that work and your own should be explained in the background.

Minor comments:

1) The N value should be given in the abstract
2) In table 1 it would be helpful to have an explanation of the weights in a footnote.
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