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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. As you mentioned the comparison of your data with NNHS 2002 in the results part and with DRI in conclusions, both of them should be mentioned in the Methods.
2. Please point out some important results (Medians of intake) in the results part.
3. You mentioned the comparison of your data with 2002 NNHS in the results part, but in the conclusions you concluded about it#s comparing with optimal intake, it would be better to be similar.
4. Please justify why you chose mothers with a child aged under 24 months.
5. As your target group was mothers with a child aged under 24 months in rural area, please consider the following issues:
   • Please mention your target group exactly in line 73.
   • Did you compare your data with the same group in 2002 NNHS or whole women? If you compared them with whole women, how did you consider the different dietary pattern in your target group?
6. In page 5, line 105, please explain how you measured height and weight (tools, situations, ...) by referring to reference.
7. In page 4, Setting and survey part, please describe your inclusion and exclusion criteria.
8. In page 5, line 103, please add you reference for the standardized questionnaire.
9. As you compare the nutrition status in this study with 2002 NNHS data, please clarify the following matters:
   • Did the studies have a same questionnaire? According to the references, it seems they were different.
   • Was the study design similar?
   • Did the subjects have a same status?
10. In page 7, line 175, please explain about table 3.
11. Page 8, line 176, what is the mean of combination foods?
12. Page 8, line 176, do the percent show the amount of nutrients intake only from some foods which was presented in table 3? If yes, please explain how did
you compare them with the nutrients intake form whole diet in 2002 NNHS and Nutrient Reference Value in table 5, whereas the other foods provide about 25% of energy, ..... 

13. Page 8, line 185-188, please describe about the association of nutrient intake and education and family size.

14. Page 8, line 200-201, please bring up the name of “other traditional foods” and “most other foods” in the sentence “Other traditional foods are......”.

15. Page 9, line 206-207, The sentence, “Furthermore the combination of foods.......” is not clear.

16. Page 9, line 217, the sentence in the parenthesis “median of meat, poultry and fish group” is not clear.

17. Page 9, line 221-222, please explain about comparing the weight of mothers with 2002NNHS data and mention it#s reference.

18. Page 10, line 226-232, please explain more about the food items in the sentences “There were 33 items in these two food groups. However, only seven items had......”. Also, these results are different with table 3.

19. Page 20 and 21, tables 4 and 5, please consider the following matters:
   • What is the difference between these 2 tables, especially about vitamins and minerals?
   • In table 4, what is your purpose about “Percent of median”?
   • Please join together the results in table 4, 5 and figure1 and present them clearly.

Discretionary Revisions

1. Page 2, line 35-36, it does not need to bring up data analysis tests.

2. In page 3, line 59, please add the exact percentage of the women who had poor nutritional status and add the reference.

3. It is suggested to point out the percent of the energy derived from carbohydrate, protein and fat.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Page 10, line 234, it would be to use “nutrient biomarkers” instead of “nutrient content of the blood”.

2. Page 10, line 242, it should be changed “significance” to “significant”.

3. Page 10, line246, please change “city” to “urban”.

4. Page 19, table 3, please add “ per week” in the title.
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**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published
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