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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Darren

Many thanks for the reviewer’s comments. We have addressed each of the points in turn.

Technical Comments
1. Rename Introduction as Background, Materials and Method as Method and Summary as Conclusion.
   Done as suggested
2. Move the Declaration section before Reference section.
   Done as suggested

Reviewer 2
1. Height and weight measurements are subject to measurement and/or recording errors, which need to be checked even using the annualized values. For example, one height measurement below (height3=50cm) is likely to be an error, and needs to be excluded from the annualized value calculation. Please check and remove outliers/errors of anthropometric measurements no matter which values will be used (annualized value or actual measurement at each age).
   I can confirm that this cleaning data was performed at the point of inputting. Any height measurement which suggested a reduction in a child’s height was omitted. It was obviously not possible to do this for weight as it was possible (and not infrequently occurred) that a child’s weight dropped at a subsequent clinic visit. After cleaning the data in this way it was still necessary to use a summary outcome measure for height and weight. We have justified our choice for this in our previous response to the reviewers and in the text of the article.

   I hope that having addressed these final comments the article can be accepted for publication.

Kind regards

Dr Francis Gilchrist

Dear Editor