

Review Report Form

Comments and Suggestions for Authors

I found this paper rather wordy.

The authors have tried to provide a more readily understood text. Changes be seen in the lines 38-44 or 384-389.

It is more common to use the term "texture modified" rather than "texture adapted". Is there a reason the authors have chosen the latter?

"Texture modified" refers to the change of food structure (in opposition to "regular texture"). "Texture adapted" refers to the texture modified to suit for people with specific needs.

It is interesting that you use Halibut as a fish - is there a reason? I notice in the word clouds halibut does not come up, but terms like cod and hake occur. Isn't halibut rather expensive for this kind of a study?

Halibut was used as it is a common fish on the menu of the ASPACE Navarra Foundation. Halibut lacks a particular flavor. In addition, the green sauce masks the fish flavor. Halibut was cheaper than hake at the date of study (4.85 €/kg vs 5.99 €/kg).

Some other odd terms seem to occur such as "soft odor" how was this defined, how were the assessors trained for it? Also use of the word "strange" - this seems a subjective term - were assessors given a "strange" standard food or might it be a different stimulus for each assessor?

The term "soft odor" has been changed in the manuscript by "mild odor" as opposed to "strong odor". CATA method can be made with non-trained judges (even, naïve consumers). The products evaluation is carried out without references. Judges select attributes from a list that they consider appropriate to describe the samples. These attributes define the sensory profile of the samples. The judges do not elaborate any attribute description.

- Meyners, M.; Castura, J. Check-All-That-Apply Questions. In *Novel Techniques in Sensory Characterization and Consumer Profiling*; Varela, P., Ares, G., Eds.; CRC Press, 2014; pp. 271–306 ISBN 978-1-4665-6629-3.

Moreover, figure 4 includes attributes like "it scatters", yet this does not seem to be mentioned elsewhere, can you say anything about it?

The mistake has been corrected and now, it refers to "it scatters" attribute in line 148 and Table 3 (line 250-252).

Is "bland" a real attribute, or just something to describe the absence of everything else.

"Bland" attribute, in sensory analysis, refers to "food with low level of flavor and without character" (according to standard ISO 5492:2008).

Dysphagia is quite a broad term and deals with individuals who have a range of swallowing difficulty. It is not clear, though I think from this paper that you are dealing with patients who have cerebral palsy. Is this the case? Please can you make it more obvious - perhaps adding it to the title. I am concerned about ethics of dysphagic patients. Certainly the study makes reference to non dysphagic assessors and their ethics - but it also refers to the authors previous publication *Innovative Food Science & Emerging Technologies* 2020, 64, 102383 for the dysphagic work - and this paper makes no mention of ethics in relation to recruiting the dysphagic assessors!!

The study of *Innov Food Sc & Emerg Technol* was carried out following the ASPACE Navarra Foundation procedure. The volunteers' relatives were informed before the start of the project. The center's speech therapists previously ensured that the dishes were adapted to the dysphagia of the volunteers. The confidentiality of the personal data was ensured according with the European legislation.

I know that figure A1 is not strictly part of the paper, but were samples provided in this diverse range of dishes? While I can see you have random codes on the dishes, the dishes themselves might influence the assessors.

The samples for the judges and the containers for each dish were presented in particular way. This procedure has been explained in the lines 104-106 with the following phrase: "Samples were presented in monadic sequence, coded with three-digit random numbers, following a balanced Williams Latin square design order [16]".