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Editor
Nutrition journal

Dear Editor,

We have revised the manuscript “The Risk of Child and Adolescent Overweight is Related to Types of Food Consumed” according to the comments recommended by the reviewers as follows:

Reviewer: Anantha Lakkakula

We have discussed the implication of our findings and their applicability of the current situation (discussion section, pg. 11, last paragraph).

1) We have indicated that this data was collected in the late 1980s in the abstract (abstract section, under methods).

2) We have used the 2010 Ogden et al paper as a reference (reference #2).

3) Now more than 25% of our references are from within the last 5 years.

4) We have provided the scoring values for the food items in the methods section.

5) Similar food groups with data from the FFQ has been previously used as exposure for other health outcomes in this population (references #16,17).

6) The FFQ was short, only 4 pages and the responses easy: circle one of 4 options. Validity correlation with a face-to-face dietary recall was high (0.77) for the principal food groups.

7) We have provided the consistent values between Table 1 and page 7 (results section, pg. 7, 1st paragraph).

8) We have clarified that we used tertile to categorize nuts consumption because this food group had a narrow range of consumption based on only 2 items on the FFQ (nuts, peanuts butter) (method section, pg. 5, last line).

9) We have discussed the bias that may have occurred during food consumption measurement due to social desirability responses (discussion section, pg 11, 1st paragraph).
10) We have discussed the previous studies findings that may have explained the protective effect observed from LNDF (discussion section, pg. 11, 1st paragraph).

Reviewer: Eva Vitariusova

1) We have added the dietary recommendation for children of school age in the conclusion section (conclusion section, pg. 13, 2nd paragraph).

Reviewer: Luis Ortiz-Hernandez

2) We have listed all the food items in the parenthesis after each food group (method section, pg 5).

3) We have clarified how we can compute for quartile and tertile (method section, pg 5).

4) We have shown that our logistic regression model was adjusted for school type, gender and soda consumption (table 2) (see footnote on table 2, pg.23).

5) We have addressed the limitation of our study due to our lack of data on physical activity and ethnicity in the discussion section (discussion section, pg 12, 2nd paragraph).

6) We have discussed the generalizable of our findings (discussion section, pg. 11, last paragraph).

7) We have changed the term “inadequate” to “insufficient” (introduction section, pg. 3, 2nd paragraph).

We hope that you will find that I have responded appropriately to all your comments and that you find these responses satisfactory. I look forward to your approval of this manuscript.

Sincerely,

Vichuda L Matthews, DrPH
(Corresponding author)
E-mail: Vmatthews@myriverbend.org