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We thank the reviewers’ for their helpful comments. We have now comprehensively revised the paper as follows.

Mark Nord

1. The analysis has been revised to include results from item response theory-based (IRT) models. Results from the Rasch model are given in Table 1. We also fitted a differential item functioning model (Table 4).

2. The context is now discussed in the Introduction (page 4, last paragraph). Other relevant work is discussed in the Discussion (page 10, second paragraph).

3. The report by Bickel et al. has been cited.

4. More details of the results for multiple-respondent households are given in Table 2 and associated text.

5. This statement has been clarified and additional information is given in Table 3.

Stephen J Blumberg

1. We did not analyse ordinal data. We think that the methods used were appropriate.

2. We are not aware of clustered versions of these statistics, nor of the IRT models. This perhaps represents a limitations which we have acknowledged (page 11, second paragraph).

3 and 4. The analyses have been revised to include results from IRT models.

5. We presented findings for consumption of green vegetables and salads because this was most strongly associated with food insecurity. Fruit consumption showed a weaker association, but the other food items were not associated with food insecurity.

6. We have addressed this point through the additional information provided in Tables 3 and 4 and associated text.

7. see 3. and 4.

8. This point has been discussed (page 10, last paragraph).

Minor points:

a) The Table legends have been revised to clarify the meaning of the figures.

b) The term ‘prevalence’ has mostly been omitted.