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**Author’s response to reviews:**

This table was also included in response to reviewers file.

Reviewer #1

3 weeks post intervention follow up is a rather short window to assess retention of intervention skills

We made it clearer that the intervention was 12 weeks long

Can you think of any tangible reason for the subpar DKT reliability

We added more information about this problem and how we could address it in future studies. We believed it may be associated with the low sample size or the low mean score of the participants.

Logic model

We added a logic model
Typos
We sent this to our editor to find typos and other issues

Reviewer #2
Restructure
We restructured the way you suggested

Focus groups
We gave more details about the focus group

Formal hypothesis testing is therefore not appropriate
We removed information on testing the hypothesis.

The purpose of measuring the above outcomes
We added a model that gives purpose to the outcome measures

Include a sentence about the next steps / future research trajectory at the end of the abstract and the background section.
We added information about future research trajectory in both places

Sample sizes require justification
We added support for our sample size required for a pilot study

Information on the registered nurse or licensed social worker
We added more information about training for the research staff and their usual roles
Give context for the food bank

We talked more about the food bank connections

Timing of the follow-up measures

We were more detailed about the length of the intervention and the time between pre- and post-data collection.

The results for the internal consistency reliability testing are currently in the methods section and should be in the results section.

We moved the internal reliability discussion to the discussion

Focus group participants as part of the intervention

We now address this in the limitation section

Clinical implications

We removed this section

Other Comments

We added this clarification, changed wording, and fixed typos.