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Reviewer's report:

This paper is much clearer now - the revisions have really improved the clarity for readers, and it is helpful to know how the women were recruited.

I think it may be still helpful to add a sentence saying that although the dietary data were collected, these are not included in any analysis or presentation of overall folic acid supplements in this paper. It may be in here now and I have missed it of course. I think this will really make the point clear, as once again I still wondered this as I was reading the paper.

My only other comment (which I know I did not say last time, but which I think would be helpful) is regarding the use of some of the language. Talking about women and their 'offspring' does not sit well with me - it almost seems that we could be reading about the female rats and their offspring. I would prefer to see this written as 'women and their infants' on each occasion in is written. Likewise, 'parturition outcomes' is an unusual term - it would be more usually written as 'birth outcomes' or 'labour and birth outcomes'.

I have no other concerns.

Thanks
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