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Reviewer's report:

I would like to thank the authors for addressing my remarks.

Additional remarks:
1) The authors write (Page 8, line 10-13) that the finding of higher levels of anemia in higher wealth urban people was in contrast to a Mexican study. They later write - "living area and wealth may modifies the probability of being in different nutritional conditions, which related with anemia". In my opinion this explanation is not valid since it doesn't address the peculiar finding of higher anemia in wealthy population (who intuitively I would guess, eats better food, hence less risk of anemia). If the possible explanation is the missing data issue - I advise to mention it here, directly with the problematic result.
2) Page 6, line 23: "(2633 of anemia was missing)". I guess that the authors mean that out of the total blood samples 2633 samples were missing. I think that it will be better to write "2633 of 13175 blood samples were missing" (if that is the correct interpretation). It's a high degree of missing values (20%). In the discussion the authors refer to it and conclude that it did not affect the results dramatically. I couldn't find similar information (regarding missing Hgb data) in the referenced papers - is this missing data ratio similar to other studies?

minor grammar issue:
* Page 8, line 12 - "modifies" should be changed to "modify"
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