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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to reviewers' comments for manuscript ID NUTN-D-18-00188R2 titled “Current status of education and research on public health nutrition in Japan: comparison with South Korea, Taiwan, and Mainland China”.

Thank you very much for the careful review of our manuscript. We are pleased that our manuscript is potentially for publication in BMC Nutrition. We have carefully revised the manuscript as follows.

Editor’s comment 1:

In accordance with BioMed Central editorial policies, please ensure your manuscript adheres to PRISMA guidelines for reporting meta-analyses and systematic reviews. Please include a completed PRISMA checklist and flowchart as additional files when submitting your revised manuscript. You can download a PRISMA checklist at the following page: http://www.prisma-statement.org/

Response:

We understand BioMed Central editorial policies. However, we are afraid that PRISMA may not be applicable because our study is not a systematic review. Nevertheless, we have filled out the
PRISMA checklist as possible. In addition, we have added date last searched articles in the Method section according to the PRISMA check list, as follows.

“First, we identified articles published in Public Health Nutrition from 2007 to 2016 through PubMed.” (Line 116-117 in the previous manuscript)

Has been changed to

“First, we conducted a literature search through PubMed in January 2017 to identify articles published in Public Health Nutrition from 2007 to 2016.” (Line 116-118 in the revised manuscript)

Editor’s comment 2:

While assessing your manuscript we found instance where the text displayed overlap with another previously published work, in particular:

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2010.09.002

Overlap with this previously published work was found mainly in lines 291 – 299.

While we understand that you may wish to express some of the same ideas contained in these publications, please be aware that we cannot condone the use of text from previously published work. We would therefore be grateful if you could reformulate the aforementioned section of your paper to resolve the overlap between your manuscript and other sources. Please ensure that, where relevant, these sources are also referenced as appropriate.

Response:

Lines 291-299 were accidentally inserted in the previous revised manuscript. We have deleted that part in the present manuscript since it is not involved with the content of our study. We are sorry for our mistake and thank you for checking our manuscript.