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Reviewer's report:

This is a solidly designed paper with interesting results. The authors are to be commended for their work. However, there need to be revisions before publication.

Compulsory Revisions

1) The language around "threshold" for reporting is confusing to the reader - please define and explain what the threshold is and who manages that.

2) There are some language use issues throughout the submission - for example figures and tables are inanimate objects - they don't do actions - Figures don't show, for example. It is recommended an editor for the journal review the paper to ensure language is appropriate.

3) There is no information in the paper about how the water testing was completed (methods) or what indicator was used, or what the numerical results of the water testing were (aside from positive). Please greatly expand on these results, and discuss their meaning.

4) It is not clear to me from the epi-curve that this is water-washed - how did the authors come to this conclusion? Please justify.

5) Were the breastfeeding data run only on infants <6 months of age - or some other age group, or the whole group of children <5? If the whole group of children under 5, the results are not adequately interpreted, as exclusive breastfeeding would be an indicator then of something else - maternal care, SES, etc. If only < a certain age, indicate in methods. Revise conclusions, etc, to reflect this.

6) There are errors in the references, with people being referred to in the paper by first name, remove these, and with wrong dates. Review and confirm all references.

7) Water tablets were seen as protective - but was this self-reported use or confirmed use of tablets? Can you talk about (if it's self-reported) the bias of self-reported data and whether it's the tablets that offered the protection, or bias among those who said it was the tablets?

In general, the results are well delineated, but there are questions as to the meaning and interpretation of the results, and what that means for policy!
Essential Revisions

Discretionary Revisions

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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