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Canadian Infants' Nutrient Intakes from Complementary Foods during the First Year of Life
James K Friel, Rhona Hanning, Corinne A Isaak, Daniel Prowse and Angela C Miller

Thanks you for consideration of our manuscript for publication in your journal. We have reviewed the above manuscript according to your reviewer’s comments. Where we have revised the manuscript after careful deliberation of all comments graciously received the text lines are give as in the re-submitted manuscript.

Reviewer # 1: Annett Hilbig

Methods
· For better understanding, in the methods the 12 food groups should be described in more detailed, perhaps in a table.
  
  • Revised text (line 130) now states that food groups are described in Table 5.

· Details for the subjects and response rate was partly described in methods and partly in results. To simplify matters, it is better to describe this either in methods or in results.
  
  • Revised and placed in results(lines 137-139)

Results
· The number of tables are not correct in results.
  
  • Corrected (lines 97, 118, 130)

· Table 2 to 4 are very complex and difficult to understand. Maybe it is better to separate the single age groups and the comparison with recommendation.
  
  • Comparisons with recommendations grouped by age and clarified in the footnotes of each table
· Table 5: It is not comprehensible, where are the significantly differences.
  
  * Significant differences are in each row. Now added and clarified to show importance of each food group at each age.

· The demographic data were described in the results. Other interesting aspects are the questions: Are there differences in the food or nutrient intake compared with recommendation between Canadian regions or age of mother or the educational level?
  
  * We examined those questions. Not all nutrients responded in a similar manner by region, age or income. There were only weak relationships e.g. age and income (r = -0.06). We did not add these findings which would have required more tables and not contribute greatly to the results. However if the reviewer/editor wishes we can add the 200 KB file as a supplement.

Discussion
· The discussion was clearly structured and well thought out, but the point of the higher education level of mother in the study compared with Canadian population should be discussed.
  
  * Discussed as requested (lines205-207, 318-320)

· Mean daily iron intakes from complementary food were lower than recommended. But this is no parameter for iron absorption and deficiency. How much is the percentage of infants with iron deficiency in this age group in Canada? This is a point, that should be discussed.
  
  * Thank you. Now added to discussion (lines 292-293)

Reviewers #2: Janis Randall Simpson

1. Sometimes this reviewer found the text somewhat confusing about whether or not the authors were referring to intake just from CF. There should be some clarification in the text all along that the intakes are from CF.
  
  * Text revised throughout the manuscript to specify nutrient intakes were from complimentary foods (CF) as suggested (lines 32, 33, 121, 172, 223, 229, 234, 268)

2. The discussion is rather long and could be shortened.
  
  * Discussion shortened as requested by about 20%.

3. Some of the numbering of Tables is incorrect in the text – see line 179.
  
  * Table numbers are revised and corrected in text
4. A number of references are missing from the list of references at the end of the list.
   - *References added (lines 466-479) references 38-42*

5. In at least one case, the wrong reference is cited – see line 267 for example. The references should all be rechecked for accuracy of citation.
   - *All references Reviewed, rechecked and corrected, thank you*

6. Tables: The number of significant figures needs to reflect the accuracy of the measurements. For example, the dietary collection methods are not likely able to detect an amount of calcium to one decimal place. The significant figures should correspond to the DRI values.
   - *All tables revised so significant digits correspond to DRI values*

7. Conclusion, line 335: This conclusion cannot be drawn from the data presented in this manuscript giving that dietary intakes from breast milk and formula was not analyzed in this study.
   - *This is correct, lines 328-331 revised*

Additional Specific Comments.

Subjects and Methods

1. Line 132: This reviewer does not understand why ANOVAs were done and what the purpose was? There do not seem to be any results or discussion related to the ANOVAs?
   - *Lines 131-133 Clarified and Revised. ANOVAs were done to determine the contribution of individual food groups at each age. Text now added to discussion (lines 303-305).*

Results

1. In the Demographics section, the comparison of results with other Canadian data should be in the discussion section rather than in the results section.
   - *Revised and materials placed in discussion (lines 197-210)*

2. Lines 186-189: This paragraph is somewhat confusing.
   - *Clarified as requested (lines 179-182).*

Please advise if further changes are needed

James K. Friel