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General
In the manuscript by Moore et al., Daily calcium intake in male children and adolescents obtained from the rapid assessment method and the 24-hour recall method" the author compare the daily calcium intake values obtained from the Rapid Assessment Method (RAM), an FFQ, for assessing daily calcium intake in 162 child and adolescent males with the values obtained from the 24-hour recall method, and they found that RAM overestimates daily calcium intake as compared with the 24-hour recall method in both child and adolescent males.

The paper deals with an important topic of which the scientific literature is scarce. The paper could be taken into consideration for the publication to increase these type of observations and of data relating the methods for the estimation of calcium intake.

However, some clarifications in the text are necessary before the paper is accepted.

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

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

1. The aim was clearly stated in the paper but, the introduction should be more specific and directional based on what is known about RAM for adult
2. The precise number of child and adolescent need to be indicate in the methods section
3. In the discussion it is need to speculate on the inopportunity to use RAM methods because of not only the Daily calcium intake for both age groups obtained from RAM is overestimated in comparison with 24-hr recall but in particular because of the amount of Daily calcium intake for both age groups obtained from RAM is “unrealistic” compared with the daily calcium intake obtain by others authors with more precise methods

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

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

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.