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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
No major compulsory revisions are necessary

Minor Essential Revisions

Abstract:
1. The authors should indicate the study site in the methods section
2. Food group frequency score (FGFS), feeding frequency scores (FFS) and dietary diversity scores (DDS) are seemingly key components of the results yet they are not mentioned at all in the methods. They are only mentioned in the results.
3. Some important key words are omitted and should be included including: Infant and child feeding index (ICFI), urban slums, India. These may replace some other key words like WHZ, WAZ, HAZ, BAZ, MUACZ. That I do not consider necessary.

Background:
1. The background section is scanty. Can the authors indicate where else that index have been used before and the results?
2. Please give more explanation about the Infant and child feeding index (ICFI)

Methods:
3. The subsection on study site should include the study population. The authors also need to mention the five slums and give a brief description of the slums including the demographic and socio-economic characteristics.
4. Did the authors do a power calculation to determine the sample size for this study? The authors need to indicate the considerations for sample size so that one can appreciate the appropriateness of the study sample included.
5. Line 63 in the abstract, the authors mention that the current study is part of a longitudinal study. Nowhere in the methods is section the longitudinal study described. A brief description of this should be provided.
6. Lines 90 to 94 are not really about data collection but rather data manipulation…so may fit better under data analysis
7. In lines 91 and 92, the authors indicate weight for length as WHZ and Length for age HAZ; WHZ is abbreviation for weight for height, while HAZ is an abbreviation for height for age rather

8. Little is said about the data collection for dietary diversity and food groups under the data collection sub-section. How was this data collected? What tools were used? The tools are only mentioned when describing the calculation of the ICFI score.

9. How did the authors decide on the scoring? Is there a standard way of scoring and a reference for the ICFI scoring that can be cited?

Results:

10. Is there a criterion for interpreting the scores: ICFI, FGFS, FFS and DDS? How does one determine say a high DDS?
11. On lines 141-146, what does “F” e.g. in “F=6.275” stand for?

Discussion:

12. In lines 233-234, the authors state “The mean ICFI score was higher for the younger children. In contrast, Srivastava and Sandhu 233 reported that complementary feeding index increased with age”
13. The explanation given in lines 235 to 237 is not adequate to explain the above and more specific explanation for the contrast is needed.
14. In lines 237-238, the authors report that “Garg and Chadha 237 reported similar observations on children aged 6-12 months” … where was their study based? When was the study conducted?
15. In lines 243-244, the authors report “In the present study, ICFI was found to be significantly associated with 243 HAZ but not with WAZ or WHZ” Why is this the case? Any explanation for this? Saying the findings are similar to the study by Srivastava and Sandhu is not adequate, there is need for an explanation of plausible reasons why it is the case.
16. In line 244-245, the authors report that “These findings are in line with the results reported by 244 Srivastava and Sandhu” … what is the context of their study? I.e. where was their study based? When was the study conducted?
17. A statement on the limitations of the study (and possibly strengths) should be included.

Conclusion:

18. In the conclusion line 278 -279, the authors indicate that “the results of the present study confirmed that the ICFI tool can be used to collect information on various components of young child feeding practices.” Why do they refer to ICFI as a tool for data collection? Nowhere in the methods was this the case…it is a score rather, constructed from several variables.

Discretionary Revisions

19. The authors may move the ethics subsection to be under the data collection
sub-section or put it just after the data collection sub-section
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