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Comments to Authors

Reviewer 1:

The manuscript reads much better now. The authors have addressed most of the comments well. However, there are still some minor typos that need correction. Also, I think the discussion part can still be improved.

There is no need to repeat background information and aim of the study in the discussion (line 345-349). The author used WHO conceptual framework (figure 1) as a reference. The discussion can be revised based on the same framework. For example, the analysis found that household/family factors are the dominant determinants, not complementary feeding, breastfeeding nor infection. The framework can also be used to enrich the strength and weaknesses part of the discussion.

Detail comments:
1. There is no need to repeat background information and aim of the study in the discussion (line 345-349)

   Background information and aim of the study have been removed from the discussion part. See track changes in the manuscript.

2. The author used WHO conceptual framework (figure 1) as a reference. The discussion can be revised based on the same framework. For example, the analysis found that household/family factors are the dominant determinants, not complementary feeding, breastfeeding nor infection. The framework can also be used to enrich the strength and weaknesses part of the discussion.

   Thank you for the relevant comment, the two parts of the study have been improved according the reviewer suggestion. See from line 379 to 384 and from line 395-397 in the manuscript.

Reviewer 2:

Comments on Abstract in result section: 95%CI is enough so it is better to remove p-value

Table 1, 2, 3. absolute numbers must be placed before percentage with confidence interval

Thank you for your comment, it has been done. All the p-values have been removed in result section of the abstract and Tables 1,2,3 adjusted.