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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have partially responded to my initial comments. However I still think there are several issues to resolve in this manuscript. Please find further comments below.

Methods

Lines 152-153: How was this recorded? Please add details for the reader to assess how objective was this measurement.

Lines 153-156: In my experience to use Likert scales with low educated populations can be quite challenging, how did it work in your sample? Did you use any visual aids?

Lines 189-190: The text on the explanation of the hypothesis testing is not quite correct. You hypothesized that the consumption will be at least 50% (lines 181-183), and what you need to test is whether your observed level of consumption is no less than 50%, beyond chance. Statistically this is not the same than what is included in lines 189-190.

Results

Lines 207: Please start this section indicating your actual sample size.

Lines 214-215: How was "important variation" assessed? What was the objective way to measure variation? Please add that information here.

Lines 217-218: Based on the text in lines 181-183, the hypothesized level of consumption was 50%, not 75%. Is this a typo? If not a typo, I strongly suggest the authors to consult with a statistician. This type of consultation seems needed to improve the level of evidence this study can provide.

Lines 221-222: The information included seems to be anecdotic, that is not from a structured data collection process, or was there some kind of data collection tool administered to interviewers? If no actual data collection was done, please indicate that is anecdotic information only.
Lines 226-227: What does "little variation" mean? Please add more objective information here.

Lines 227-229: Two issues with this text: a) it seems that some words are missing, please check, and b) marginally statistical results (p<0.10) are usually reported as "tendency", is that what you mean? If not, what exactly you mean with "tended to be higher". If not statistical test was conducted please indicate that you are referring to observed data only.

Lines 258-260: Again, this seems to be anecdotic information, unless it was systematically collected. For example, not all interviewers may take the same amount of notes, unless it was part of the protocol they were supposed to follow. Similarly, what about if only those having good experiences with participants are the ones mentioning how happy they were.

Lines 265-268: I strongly recommend the authors to rely on inferential statistics in order to make such claims. This research could provide more useful evidence if these methods are used. Otherwise I suggest the authors to revise the language to indicate that this statement is based purely on observed data and any observed differences may actually be due to chance.

Discussion

Lines 313-315: So there was systematic data collection from interviewers? If so, please include that information in the Methods section. If not, please do not include this as a strength of the study. Any non-systematically collected data can provide biased information.

Lines 329-330: And also interviews comments!

Lines 331: In the Discussion is where the reader learns that you weighted meals. I asked for this information above, please add details in the Methods section.

Lines 322-341: If the decision is made not to include further objective, statistical testing information then I suggest you add that to the list of limitations.

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

No

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

No

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

Unable to assess
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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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