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19 September 2013

The Editor
BMC International Health and Human Rights

RE: Re-submission of manuscript ID MS: 1764057119786251 titled, ‘Factors in the Management of Feeding in Nursery School Children as perceived by their mothers in rural Bondo County, Kenya’.

Dear Dr. Crow:

We appreciate the thorough and prompt review of our work. We have made all the suggested changes in the manuscript. We have read through the comments and addressed them in a point-by-point fashion - indicated in the text of the revised version of our work (in red). It is with great pleasure that we re-submit this manuscript for publication in BMC International Health and Human Rights.

Reviewer #1

Major Compulsory Revisions

Comment 1. Clearly, the authors did not seem to understand my concern: that the specific outcome they studied should be defined. Their answer here seems to have rather added more confusion than clarity to their paper. Regardless on how you code your outcome variable (0 and 1, etc), it makes no sense if one does not know what outcome has been studied. My concern is that the authors should clearly state what outcome they fitted in the logistic regression; that is to define what the odds ratio mean. My concern is not how they coded the outcome, but on what outcome they studied. It should be understood that the answer provided regarding the reference group should refer to the covariates (independent variables) rather than to the outcome.: in a binary logistic regression, it is the
covariates that you indicate the reference category and not the outcome. The authors state that they studied the management of feeding, but management can be, for example, good or not good, positive or negative, or other indicators; the authors therefore need to indicate what indicator of management represents their outcome. The titles of the tables have improved but the studied outcome should be included in the title of the tables when clearly defined.

Response 1. We appreciate the reviewer for raising this important point. In addition, we apologize for creating more confusions than clarity. We did not initially understand what the reviewer was requesting us to do. We have now addressed this point and pointed out the outcome in all the sections. We added the following statements in each of the sections below:

Abstract: ‘In a logistic regression model, bad management of feeding was the dependent variable while factors perceived to affect management of feeding were the independent variables.’

Methodology: ‘Bad management of feeding was the dependent variable while all other factors were the independent variables in the logistic regression models. P-values #0.05 were considered statistically significant.’

On Table legends with ORs: ‘Bad management of feeding was the dependent variable while all other factors were the independent variables in the logistic regression models.’

If you have any further comments and/or suggestions, we would be happy to address these concerns.

With highest regards,

Prof. Collins Ouma, PhD