

For research article: Does awareness of Malaysian Healthy Plate associates with adequate fruit and vegetable intake among Malaysian adults with non-communicable diseases? [Manuscript ID: nutrients-2717067]

Responses to Reviewer 3's Comments

1. Summary

On behalf of all the co-authors, thank you very much for taking time to review this manuscript. Please find the detailed responses below and the corresponding revisions/corrections highlighted/in track changes in the re-submitted files

2. Questions for general evaluation

Questions for General Evaluation	Reviewer's Evaluation	Response and Revisions
Does the introduction provide sufficient background and include all relevant references?	Can be improved	Corresponding response in the point-by-point response as below
Are all the cited references relevant to the research?	Can be improved	Corresponding response in the point-by-point response as below
Is the research design appropriate?	Yes	Corresponding response in the point-by-point response as below
Are the methods adequately described?	Yes	Corresponding response in the point-by-point response as below
Are the results clearly presented?	Yes	Corresponding response in the point-by-point response as below
Are the conclusions supported by the results?		

3. Point-by-point response to comments and suggestions for authors

Point 1: It is not really clear the Methodology, I recommended the authors to improve the study design.

[Authors' response: We have revised the study design and sampling section according to the reviewer's comment from line 127 to line 136 in the revised version of manuscript.](#)

Point 2: The references are appropriate, but some are cited twice, and the author have to remove the duplicates.

Authors' response: We double-checked the references and removed the duplicates accordingly.

Point 3: you have to change (citation) by [this]

Authors' response: We have revised the format of the citation accordingly.

Point 4: I recommended the authors to improve the Introduction, including more recently studies around the world.

Authors' response: We have revised and improved the Introduction as per reviewer's comment, from line 52 to line 66 in the revised version of manuscript.

Point 5: Cite 17 and 18 is duplicated, you have to remove one

Authors' response: We have doubled-checked and removed the duplicates reference.

Point 6: Cite 14 must be revised.

Authors' response: We have revised the citation number 14.

Point 7: Cite 6 must be completed

Authors' response: We have revised the citation number 6.

Point 8: Cite 9 must be revised totally.

Authors' response: We have revised the citation number 9.