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Reviewer's report:

General

The manuscript has improved, and the authors attempted to address reviewers concerns. Still, a few minor points should be addressed, for clearer communication.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Abstract - I would suggest being straightforward and mention the use of Item Response Theory, as is, the mention is only indirect.

page 4. Next to last sentence. In the improved wording for the 'aim', the word functioning is now used. Is this standard terminology for item response theory, again you could say the functioning is being tested using Item Response Theory.

The text explaining the IRT and interpretation of scores and values is much cleaner and helpful to the entire paper.

Results. Tables 1, 2, and 3. I am confused where the results for the 'DIF' model come in? What are the meaning of the column/headings for last two columns of Tables 1 and 2. Or, are the Results of the 'DIF' Model in Table 3? Basically, the "DIF" abbreviation in the text, has not been transfered to a table heading or footnote.

Results 4. Are the results from the standards food security scores by the US HFSS computation? and not by any models? Again clarify with the Table Title, heading, or footnote.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No
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