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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1. This paper needs to be proofread thoroughly. There are grammatical errors in almost every paragraph, and in at least one location the data in the text did not match data in the table.

2. The description of the statistical analysis was a bit unclear. For example, why is it “likely” that legume intake would be confounded by age or religion? Did the author control for clustering in the first analysis? It was only clear that it was done in the second analysis. Did the author check for effect modification by gender? Without that information, it was unclear why the analysis needed to be performed for men and women separately. Did the author do any tests to assess if the variables in the models were significantly associated with the outcome?

Minor Revisions:

1. The discussion of the need to assess inter-rater compatibility of the NFHS-3 questionnaire is a good one; however, your argument that this is less of an issue because the instrument is used in lots of settings does not make sense. You should clarify this argument.

Discretionary Revisions:

1. The author might want to address issues around single food item studies. How could this information be used? Is it prudent to design programs around a single food item? I don’t know all the answers to these questions, but they are worth considering nonetheless.

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

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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