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Author’s response to reviews:

Fiber Paper Reviewer Comments

Dear Reviewers,

Thank you for your review of our revised comments and additional suggestions. Below we have provided detailed responses to your individual comments.

BMC Peds Reviewer 2:

1 The authors have addressed all my comments well and provided additional analyses and elaboration where needed. There is just one more comment regarding table 1 that requires additional clarification. First of all, how were weighted estimates calculated? There is a reference (30) provided in the method section on weighting methodology. However, I believe the reader would benefit from at least a brief description of the methods used, which would make the results understandable from solely reading this manuscript.

We added more specifics regarding the weighting methodology in the methods section.

2 Second, why are weighted estimates used instead of absolute numbers? Since it is a descriptive table, I believe it would be more appropriate to provide absolute numbers and percentages of the
population characteristics in the highest and lowest quartile of fiber intake.

Weighted estimates have been provided across all FITS publications and analyses of FITS datasets to control for bias and provide a truer estimate of the US population and not only the study sample. Added this explanation in the footnote.

BMC Peds Reviewer 3:

1 Throughout the manuscript you discuss dietary fiber, with this concept are both soluble and insoluble considered together. Please clarify.

Clarified this throughout.

2 For the Bonferroni correction did you consider a conservative estimated by including the 19 nutrients, did you possibly consider vitamin A and folate equivalents as more multiple additional groups that could have summed to a higher number of individual nutrients? Please make that more clear.

We added the Bonferroni calculation to the footnote – the actual calculation for the 19 nutrients (considering a p value of 0.05) was 0.0027 so we did round down to be conservative. If we increase the number of tests to 25, the Bonferroni value is 0.002 exactly.