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Reviewer’s report:

Minor essential revisions

Line 167: Sample sizes in Table 2 indicate that there were more missing data. Please mention these here as well (for example by stating that sample size differs across analyses because of missing data in the other variables).

Lines 171-175: It is not necessary that you state these numbers here as all numbers are reported in table 1.

Line 174: Although most people probably know what BMI means, abbreviations should be defined when they are first mentioned and, thus, it should read “body mass index (BMI)”. Please report units when you report descriptive statistics, in this case “kg/m²”.

Lines 196-198: Why was BMI used as a categorical variable? I understand that categories are reported for sample description, but I don’t think that it makes sense in the regression analyses. Are results different when you use BMI as a continuous predictor in the regression analyses?

Line 216: As intention was measured with only three items, please also present the other two items here.

Lines 226-240: Please insert a table, which includes the 21 snack foods and which of these were classified as unhealthy.

Lines 258-259: This sounds like you mean-centered the interaction term, but I guess that you mean-centered the two continuous predictors and then calculated the interaction term with these mean-centered variables, right? (as this would be the correct way to do it)

Lines 271-280: I think it would be nice if you include a table showing all correlations between variables. For example, is there actually no correlation between BMI and all the snack-related measures?

Line 432: typo

Table 1: It makes little sense when the headings of the last two columns are n & % when sometimes M, SD, and range are reported. As you specify M, SD, and range in the second column, may be you can do it like this for n and % also (e.g.,
“male (n, %)”).
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