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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Olivier Bruyère,

We thank you for giving us the opportunity to resubmit a revision of our manuscript entitled “Determinants of prebiotic vegetable consumption: the extended Theory of Planned Behaviour” for publication in Archives of Public Health. In the attached revised version of the manuscript, we have tried to answer to each of the issues raised by the reviewers. Below you can find a point-by-point response overview of how we have addressed the commentaries and incorporated the suggestions.

We hope that the revised manuscript will meet your and the reviewers’ approval. The comments raised were very helpful in improving the manuscript and we would like to thank you and the reviewers for spending time, energy, and effort in reviewing this manuscript.

Sincerely,
Valérie Broers

Reviewer reports:
Reviewer #1: The manuscript is about acceptance after some modifications.

Response: We thank the reviewer for the time and effort spent on reviewing this manuscript. We will respond to each comment and hopefully meet your approval.

Line 41:
In the sentence 'benefit from the health benefits of (prebiotic) vegetables' must be rewritten because the word 'benefit' is repeated very closely. In the Line 366 also has the same writing problem.

Response: We agree that this sentence could be improved, we changed it to ‘experience the health benefits of (prebiotic) vegetables' (line 40 and 458).

The authors should seek recent publications in the field (2017-2019) and update the introduction of the manuscript.
Response: We thank the reviewer for notifying us of the dated publications and we have updated some of the publications. See line 59-62, 108-116, 161-162, 465-466.

Please review the English and the punctuation of the article.

Response: We thank the reviewer for this suggestion and we have asked a native English speaker and fellow researcher to review the English and punctuation of the article, see track changes throughout the article. We have added her name in the acknowledgements, see line 656-657.

The results obtained are interesting and in the summary and conclusion they should be presented in more detail. In both the summary and the conclusion there is a very general description.

Response: We thank the reviewer for the compliment and we agree that the results can be presented in more detail. We have added a new paragraph indicating possible interventions that could be implemented based on the results, see line 553-571.