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Dear Nutrition Journal Editorial Team,

Dear Reviewers

Thanks, for the second feedback from the reviewers on the manuscript “Validation of digital photographs as a tool in 24-h recall, for improvement of dietary assessment among rural populations in developing countries”, that my co-authors and I have submitted to be considered for publication in the Nutrition Journal.

We have taken into account all the comments and suggestions, please find below a point-by-point response to the concerns.

Sincerely

Claudia Lazarte

Correspondence: Claudia Lazarte, Department of Food Technology, Engineering and Nutrition, Lund University, P.O. Box 124, SE-221 00 Lund, Sweden. E-mail: Claudia.Lazarte@food.lth.se

Second reviewer's report

Title: Validation of digital photographs as a tool in 24-h recall, for improvement of dietary assessment among rural populations in developing countries

Version: 3 Date: 4 July 2012
Reviewer: Emma Foster
Reviewers report:
The English in this manuscript is now much improved and there are just one or two tweaks to the English which are detailed below. I do still have issue with the amount of focus on correlation coefficients. Please see comments below on discussion section.

1. Page 15 - Lines 360-373 please discuss the width of the limits of agreement. It is this that is important not whether most of the differences lie within those limits (which they will because of the way the limits are calculated!). Done, in lines 340-343 is explained the limits of agreement of food categories and in lines 370-375 is explained the limits of agreement of nutrient intake, the discussion is extended in “discussion section”.
2. Page 16 - Lines 382-383 - You state 'thus improving the accuracy of the estimates of individual intakes, as it is demonstrated by the presented results' Improved compared to what? A standard 24hr recall with no photographs? If that's the case then these data are not presented in the results. It has been re-written (lines 384-386).

3. Page 16 - Line 386 - I do not think 'observe' is the correct word. How about 'record' or 'estimate'? Done (line 389)

4. Page 16 - Line 397 - change 'as' to 'an' and remove 's' from underestimations. Done (line 400)

5. Page 17 - Lines 409-410 - You say significant differences were found 'due to variance within each group owing to the high variability among individual food consumption' However the variation is in the difference between two methods measuring the same thing in the same person. I think this is due individual variation in accuracy of recording of food intake/estimation of portion size?. For the analysis of comparison of two means (t-test (p-value) for the difference between two samples), the mean and both the variance between groups and the variance within groups are calculated. Thus, I have tried to explain that even though the means between groups are very close (identical means, small variance between groups), the contribution of the variance within groups (which is bigger) may be the responsible to get results of P-value which show significant differences. And the variance within groups is due to the wide variability in the amount of individual food consumption, each individual consumption is different to the others (line 411).

6. Page 17 - Lines - 416-445 - I note that in the results section the correlation coefficients are only briefly mentioned. I understand that previous studies have used correlations and therefore this enables comparison. A significant amount of the discussion still focuses on correlation. This is not a meaningful statistic in looking at whether two methods are in agreement. It demonstrates only that there is a relationship between the two methods which when they have been used to assess the same thing on the same day in the same person it would be quite amazing if there were not! I would suggest reducing this discussion to a paragraph at most. The discussion of the Bland Altman statistics is good. Correlation discussion has been reduced (lines 419-433).

7. Page 20 - Line 480 - 'which implies'....the implication is missing from the end of the sentence. Done (line 473)

8. Page 21 - Line 509 - 'were under the percentage of underweight' this does not make sense - Please re-word. Done (line 502)

9. Page 21 - Line 521 - Suggest replace 'between' with 'for'. Done (line 513)

10. Page 22 - Line 527 - Change 'maintain' to 'keep'. Done (line 529)

11. Page 22 - Line 531 - Change 'maintaining' to 'keeping'. Done (line 523)

12. Page 22 - Line 532 - Change 'in' to 'with'. Done (line 524)
Reviewer's report:
No further revision is necessary. All suggested changes have been made.

Version: 3 Date: 9 July 2012
Reviewer: Janine Higgins
Reviewer's report:  
No further revision is necessary. All suggested changes have been made.

Version: 3 Date: 8 July 2012
Reviewer: Yue Cheng
Reviewer's report:  
- Minor Essential Revisions
  1. Page2, second paragraph of abstract, for sentence’ Although all nutrients were somewhat underestimated, Pearson´s coefficients are highly significant: >0.93 for all.’ I think it should be ‘ Pearson’s coefficients are high (>0.93 for all) and statistically significant.’ Done (lines 45-46)

2. Page 9, first paragraph, a full stop is missing. Done

3. Page15, last line, I prefer ‘small differences’ rather than ‘low differences’. Done (line 372)

Version: 3 Date: 3 July 2012
Reviewer: DA-HONG WANG
Reviewer's report:  
The authors have well answered the points raised by the reviewer in their revised manuscript.