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Reviewer’s report:

This is a worthy paper of a generally poorly described area of dietary surveys. The paper describes the impact of total disaggregation of mixed meat and fish dishes on intakes of commodities and select nutrients using a large, well characterised dietary survey in Australia. For the most the work is well described and detailed. The conclusions drawn by the authors are adequate and reflective of the body of work. There are a number of areas where the authors could strengthen their paper I believe.

Firstly, I would suggest recreating tables 2 and 4. It would be clearer for the reader to have the proportion consumer and per consumer intake data present together and also discussed concurrently throughout the text as one has to keep jumping between the tables to get an understanding of the per consumer data. While the tables are large, perhaps it could be split by age group. For example, while lamb is highlighted in the text as having the largest per consumer intake values, the proportion of consumers is <10%.

Details of statistical analyses should be listed in the table legends and clarified in the tables rather than just the text for ease of interpretation.

If possible, it would be helpful to account for underreporters in the tables which characterised contribution to nutrient intake would be helpful, or at least a statement to the effect that there was/was not an effect.

If the data were available, details of the contribution to other dietary fats (e.g. MUFA/PUFA) would be helpful given that meat is a significant contributor to their daily intakes. In this article, it is stated that females have a higher % of fat from meat/poultry/fish than males but there is no real difference in saturated fat intake, hence this suggests that the difference is coming from other fatty acids and should be commented on. It should also be clarified in Table 5 that the proportion of energy and line 316 key nutrients from meat/poultry/fish are 'per day'.

The discussion would benefit from a repeat of results being stated and include more 'higher level' critique - e.g. lines 280 - 293. also comment on the impact of lines 294 - 302. Discussion data should also link % consumer and consumer intake data.

The authors should bear in mind the usefulness of this aggregated data for non-nutrition purposes e.g. assessment of intakes of contaminants of food chemicals which may occur in meat. Such disaggregated intake data is highly suited for this use.
Minor: line 316 contains a minor typo and referencing style requires attention.
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