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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr. Ali, dear reviewers,

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to revise and improve our manuscript. The replies to the reviewers’ comments can be found below. A native speaker has corrected the language throughout the manuscript. All changes regarding the reviewers’ comments are highlighted in grey in the document.

Thank you for considering our revised manuscript for publication.

Sincerely,

Nanette Stroebele-Benschop

Editor Comments:

Please revise the language throughout the manuscript to avoid the errors.

Authors’ response:

A native speaker has corrected the language throughout the manuscript.
Reviewer reports:

Lemma Getacher Altaye, Masters Degree (Reviewer 1):

Comments on NUTN-D-19-00206_reviewer

1. General comments

* It is good study, interesting and re-searchable area

* Needs a very little language edition.

* Comparison cross sectional study was very good for food choice pattern of professional long-haul truck drivers in home and at work site.

Response: Thank you for your comments. A native speaker has corrected the language throughout the manuscript.

* What is your analysis method \( \it{it} \) is not appear in the abstract and method section.

Response: We used bivariate analyses to calculate the results. We have added this information to the abstract and in the method section.

2. Specific comments

* Line 45 abstract part \( \it{the} \) conclusion not clearly in line with your title and objective. Is it poor or good food choice pattern in professional long-haul truck drivers?

Response: We have made the attempt to better explain our results in the discussion and conclusion section (e.g. line 221, 238, 267). Food choice patterns of truck drivers appear to be different depending on their location. Better food choice patterns were observed at home compared to when at work. These results open opportunities for interventions regarding better food choices during trips helping truck drivers to choose convenient, easy to eat, yet healthier foods than e.g. sausages.

* Line 93= you are saying that "Data was assessed based on a self-developed self-report questionnaire". Have you check details as there no is standard questionnaire?

Response: We have looked at various existing questionnaires but felt that none fit our study purpose. We have added a sentence as to why we developed our own questionnaire on line 92ff.
in addition, the word data is plural by itself. So, you have to use "data were" throughout your document.

Response: Thank you for noting this oversight. The wording was changed throughout the manuscript.

"(e.g. weight status groups with availability of gas cooker, microwave, cooler box)". It doesn't seem a sentence. It lacks something. Please check it again.

Response: Thank you. We have corrected the sentence.

your sample size in abstract said that 404, even if it is not explained in method part. But here you are saying "In total, 419 truck drivers completed the questionnaire". So what is the controversy?

Response: In the sentence following this information, we reported that 15 participants were excluded. However, it now states: “…404 truck drivers were included in the data analysis.” (line 138f.)

so what is your response rate?

Response: The response rate was 69.5%. This is now stated in line 136f..

what measures did you take to minimize your limitations and any other bias?

Response: We are not sure what the reviewer means by this question. In order to obtain information on this population that has never been studied in Europe in such a way, we decided to use a cross-sectional design which does not allow to determine causal relations. We also decided against various more precise methods such as weighing the participant or conducting a 24-hour recall in order to increase the willingness to participate since we wanted a clearer picture of this population rather than specifics such as macro- or micronutrient content of one day or the exact body weight.

To reduce any bias, we, for instance, translated the questionnaire in various languages to increase the willingness and ability to participate. We also tried to keep the questionnaire rather short for the same reasons.

Zakari Ali, BSc, MSc (Reviewer 2): This study explores with a cross-sectional design the food patterns of long-haul truck drivers driving through Germany. The target population may be a minority group whose work demands potentially influence their food choice, therefore, this study idea is interesting. I have some comments for the authors to consider.
Methods

- Describe the assessment of weight/height and calculation of BMI and which classification categories were used.

Response: All data was assessed by self-report (see table 1). We have added the BMI calculation, see line 132.

- Provide some more detail on which statistical tests were used for which variables. The current form is too general.

Response: We have provided more details on the statistical tests used in the data analysis section, starting in line 121.

- It is not appropriate to begin the data analysis section with brackets (Revise). See line 120.

Response: Thank you for noticing this mistake. A part of the text was missing.

Results

- Table 3. Write out the actual p-values to 2 decimal places in the table instead of the asterisks used (Revise).

Response: The p-values were written out.

Abstract

- Line 43. Are you missing the word 'be'? (...appeared to ??? associated…).

Response: Thank you for noticing this mistake. We have added the missing “be”.

Ella Hasso Haddad, DrPH, MS, RD (Reviewer 3): This descriptive study is interesting but does little to inform nutrition education efforts for this vulnerable group. Also, it does not meet standards of scientific writing or English language grammar and usage.

Response: A native speaker has corrected the language throughout the manuscript.

Table 3 is not self-explanatory and the food categories are not clearly defined.

Response: We have added some information to table 3 in the hopes that it would clarify its content. The food categories were developed based on the two studies [19, 20] referred to in the
manuscript. We agree with the reviewer that there is no clear definition or distinction between the food categories.