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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer reports:

Reviewer #1: 1. Could the authors consider writing their manuscript according to one of the EQUATOR reporting guidelines?

Answer from the authors: Thank you. We have consulted the CONSORT 2010 checklist and added the following sentences in the methods section of the manuscript to ensure all needed information is given:

The study protocol has been described in detail elsewhere: http://www.ANZCTR.org.au/ACTRN12618001221246.aspx.

Each participant served as their own control in this within-between subjects design. The control treatment was administered first for each part of the study explained below.

2. Please give more information regarding the international web panel provider.

Answer from the authors: We have now added in the manuscript that the web panel provider is ISO certified and based in Australia.

3. Could the authors consider making some kind of sensitivity analyses based on relevant individual characteristics such as socioeconomic characteristics or live style.
Answer from the authors: This would be interesting but considering the 5 different types of FOP labels, the sample size is not sufficient to be able to do this. We have adjusted all the models for sex, age, household monthly income level, education level, involvement in grocery shopping, nutrition knowledge, and self-reported diet quality.

Reviewer #2: The manuscript is clearly written and well-structured. The paper contributes to the public health nutrition field by providing information on a topic for which there is no Belgian data.

Answer from the authors: Thank you very much

I have few suggestions to the authors:

Background
-Page 4, line 14: The paper of Egnell et al., 2018 does not appear in the References section. Could you please reference all the papers relating to the different aspects of the methods used (food choices, objective understanding and perceptions).

Answer from the authors: Indeed, thanks for point that out. The paper has now been added to the reference list.

Methods
-Page 6, line 16: I suggest adding the following sentence: "The survey asked: "Assuming you were interested in purchasing this type of food, which food would you buy?"".

Answer from the authors: We have now added this sentence, as suggested

Results
-Tables 2 and 3: These tables should include, as table legends, that the GDA label was used as the reference of the models.

Answer from the authors: We have now added this in the title of the relevant tables, as suggested.

Discussion
-Page 14, line 17-19: This limitation would not be appropriate, since other studies using the same methods have observed significant results. In addition, the perception is not dependent on the number of products/food categories provided. Please clarify.

Answer from the authors: We agree with this comment and have therefore removed this limitation from the manuscript.