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The manuscript describes the nutritional status of infants with complementary food and compared this with recommendations. Only a few studies have analysed the intake of nutrients only from complementary food. In general, such kind of information is relevant and worth to be published.

Methods

· For better understanding, in the methods the 12 food groups should be described in more detailed, perhaps in a table.
· 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.

Results

· The number of tables are not correct in results.
· 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.
· Table 5: It is not comprehensible, where are the significantly differences.
· 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?

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.
· 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.

Summary rating
The topic is of special interest as only a few information exists concerning the infants nutrition only for complementary foods. Those data are basic for a repeating market survey and for the question whether infant feeding patterns and nutrient intakes were influenced by new recommendations.

For these reasons the paper is recommended for publication in spite of the points mentioned above. However, a revision of the tables is necessary.
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