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Reviewer’s report:

What does clinically significant for fruit and vegetable preference mean?

Authors should think about their use of "prediction" in interpreting results—2 measures at the same time should be described as associated. A baseline measure might "predict" a later measure. This reader didn't find the timing specified.

It's predictable that higher fruit and vegetable consumption (or subscore) would predict higher HEI and for sure total Vegetable score in the HEI.

The language of using fp, total vegetables, cooking SE—without differentiating between consumption and score is awkward.

The reviewer understands that the Beta weights are units. The authors don't tell the readers what the units mean and what the units are in the tables.

In table 2 and 3 it isn't clear to the reader what the difference in model 1 and model 2. The use of odds ratio in the tables is awkward. The authors are demonstrating the likelihood in a higher score on one thing based on a higher score in the other.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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