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### PART 1: Review Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer’s comment</th>
<th>Author’s comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Compulsory** REVISION comments | □ The manuscript is poorly written throughout.  
□ As English is not the native language of the authors, the manuscript must be revised by a native English speaker. It makes it difficult to understand the message the authors are trying to provide.  
□ There is a need to better elaborate the introduction, so the authors can build the case/importance for their study. There is solid evidence in the literature that PA and caloric intake is related to BMI. What makes this study unique despite being conducted in Celaya, Mexico? What new we can learn from this study?  
□ The structure of the manuscript should change to (Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion).  
□ The discussion needs to be significantly expanded and authors need to go more in |
depth in their findings.

- The literature shows that male and female are different regarding PA, Caloric Intake, and BMI, why the data were not analysed separated by sex?
- It would be interesting to see correlation analysis separated by sex.
- Tables need to be redesigned. Lines used to separate variables should be removed. There is no need to put the source since the data is coming from the study. I recommend the authors to take a look in the Plos One guidelines for developing tables.
- The authors need to provide a rationale/justification/reference for categorizing caloric intake in such way.
- What category of PA is “slight”. Is this referring to Light intensity PA?
- Caloric intake is not the same as food quality, meeting or not the recommendation for fruits and vegetables. On page 7 the authors bring this discussion “In Chile, it was found that in general...”. I am not sure if that fits in this paper. Maybe it should be included at the end when expanding the conclusions of the of the study.
Table 4 – OR - it is really hard if not impossible to understand this table. Moreover, I would run the analysis again and check the results. OR values of 102, 103, 106

- Authors need to develop a paragraph describing strengths and limitations of the study.
Minor REVISION comments

- Title should change “Frequency of food consumption” to “caloric intake” as this is the variable being analysed and not frequency.
- Authors are examining a specific age group, 60 to 70 years old; and the authors are using 60 and over, this gives a different idea of the sample. Please change accordingly.
- Abstract: “gl” needs to change to “df” – degrees of freedom.
- Introduction: “… adequate dietary intake…” – an adequate dietary intake may translate to better quality of life.
- 2.2.3 Outcome variable: there are repetitions “…with as little as possible of clothes”. Moreover, the language needs to be improved.
- Sample size: if 61 would be enough, why 100? A justification is needed. Maybe, to account for possible drop out, incomplete data, etc.
- Sampling and randomization needs more details
- Results and discussion: The first paragraph should be placed at the end along with other potential strengths and limitations
The first paragraph needs to summarize the study findings.
Optional/General comments

The authors sought to determine the relationship between calories intake, PA, and nutritional status (i.e., BMI) in a representative sample of older adults registered in day care centres in Celaya, Mexico. The strength of the study lies only in the representative random sample procedure to select the participants. The relationship between the variables here in examined is well-established in the literature and the authors fail to provide a rationale/justification of the importance of replicating this study in Celaya, México. Although PA, food intake/calorie intake, overweight/obesity continues to be a concern world wild, the manuscript fails to provide new insights into the problem; potentially because the way the data was analysed. For example, there is a well-known difference in PA, BMI, and probably calories intake between male and female. The authors acknowledge such difference based on other studies, however, their data were not analysed as such.

In face of the mentioned I am afraid that this manuscript needs substantial amount of work, before being considered for publication in this journal.

Hopefully these comments will help the authors
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