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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear reviewers/editor,

Thank you for your kind feedback on the manuscript.

I have made the requested changes to the manuscript and have highlighted these in red font in the attached file. I have also listed the specific changes that I made to the manuscript below.

Best wishes,

Mark Hobden

Reviewer reports:

Reviewer #1:

Line 30-31: Try to keep the aims in the abstract more specific and focused on what you are actually doing. Updated. Please see line 30 – 33.

Line 32: Say "standardised breakfast". It can be confusing otherwise as some people use breakfast as the preload meal. Changed throughout manuscript.
Line 41: Make this into a proper sentence "The duration…." Sentence updated. Please see line 40.

Line 73: Needs a reference. Added. Please see line 73, and reference list.

Line 80: Needs a reference Added. Please see line 78 and reference list.


Line 125: Why was a cut off of 13 used for dietary restraint. This seems very high and most studies I have seen use a cut off of 10. The references provided do not provide any justification for the cut offs they are just references for the validity of the questionnaire. Sentence (Line 124-125) updated.

Line 160 needs a reference. Sentence updated, no ref required. Please see line 166-169.

Were the individual measures of appetite from the VAS analysed. These parameters do measure different things so should be measured individually also. I found this unclear. Yes they were, please see sentence on line 237.

Line 224-225: This is discussion and does not belong in the results. Acknowledged - moved to the discussion section (Line 286).

Line 231-235: Provide significance levels here Added. Please see line 241-243.

Change the wording of test meal to ad libitum meal throughout. It can be confusing as the test meal may imply the preload meal either. Changed throughout manuscript.

Reviewer #2: This is an interesting paper and it is important to publish such procedures and processes particularly in nutrition research.

The paper would benefit from some clarifications:

antibiotic usage, please clarify if this is continued usage of more than 6 months in any time period pre study. Sentence updated. Please see Line 120.

pregnancy- was pregnancy status self reported or was a pregnancy test performed. Updated in the text. Please see Line 122.

what method of randomisation was used, were any restrictions imposed? Updated in the text. Please see Line 134-135.
please provide the macronutrient composition of the ready meal and chocolate bar and laso the breakfast meal. How did the macronutrient composition compare to recommended daily intakes? Updated in the text. Please see Line 144-145 and Line 165.

Its unclear in the text what happens upon arrival at the clinical unit as this arrival is precisely timed. I would be interested to know how many participants attended on one day and how many staff were needed to ensure that meals were provided according to the planned schedule. Updated in the text. Please see Line 150-156.