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Reviewer’s report:

The current pilot presents an interesting question that is both practical and useful to appetite related researchers. One of the major flaws of the study is that it is neither a cross over study nor is it adequately powered to ensure that it is testing the required hypothesis. However the researchers are aware of this and it is highlighted in the discussion. In general it is a very well prepared manuscript, it is appropriate as a pilot study, however it has to be considered how useful the data is given the restrictions highlighted above.

Line30-31: Try to keep the aims in the abstract more specific and focused on what you are actually doing.

Line 32: Say "standardised breakfast". It can be confusing otherwise as some people use breakfast as the preload meal.

Line 41: Make this into a proper sentence "The duration…"

Line 73: Needs a reference

Line 80: Needs a reference

Line 409: again standardised breakfast

Line 225: 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.

Line 160 needs a reference

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.

Line 224-225: This is discussion and does not belong in the results.

Line 231-235: Provide significance levels here

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.
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