

RESPONSE TO REVIEWER 3_REV 2

Thank you for your diligent revisions. I believe that these have greatly improved the manuscript. However, I am attaching some comments between the lines.

Author Response: The authors thank the reviewer for appreciating the revisions done and this was largely due to your comments which have tremendously improved the quality and clarity of the manuscript.

1) Title:

R. The type of study is: cross-sectional study. Authors should change to design that they have indicated in the design

Response: The title has been revised accordingly to reflect the design.

2) Introduction:

R. I understand this is an inclusionary criterion. However, authors must be consistent. If the authors justify the research problem by not finding studies in adults, the inclusion criteria should have included only adults. I suggest the authors modify the introduction

Response: The authors thank the reviewer for this comment. The clinical criterion for adulthood (≥ 18 years) is well within the age range of the participants of the study (20-70 years). There is a lack of data on this demographic (knowledge, awareness and attitude on DF's in Saudi Arabia), as well as in pediatric cases. Furthermore, one of the reviewers suggested that this type of study should have been conducted in adolescents as well since healthy eating should start at young age, we are already planning to conduct that. The authors nevertheless revised the last paragraph of the introduction section.

3) Materials and Methods

a) R. Thank you for considering the suggestion. However, I have some questions:

I think there is a problem with the following answers:

"less than once a week", "1-2 times a week"

If it's less than once a week, they don't consume. I think the item is unclear.

Response: The authors agree that "less than once a week" is a little bit ambiguous. However, "Less than once a week" was explained to the respondents as whether they consume the food items once every two weeks or once a month etc. "Don't consume" was a separate option for each food item and the authors at the same time would like to draw the reviewers' attention towards analysis and reporting part of this section in table 2 where "regularly consuming", "rarely consuming" and "not consuming" were categorized from the responses and presented as "Yes", "rarely" and "No" respectively.

b) R. I don't agree with the authors. I think the study would be more valid if the authors included the statistical data on the validity and reliability of the questionnaire

Response: The authors thank the reviewer for this suggestion. Analysis on the validity and reliability of the final questionnaire used in this study which was tested on 50 participants during the pilot study was explained in section 2.2 and also included as a separate supplementary file (S2), where estimation of Cronbach's α for each section was explained in detail.

Results

R. Please include in the statistical analysis section the tests used for table 1.

Response: Many thanks for the suggestion. Chi-square test was used to determine the difference among genders as mentioned in section 2.3 of the revised draft.