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Reviewer's report:

I have no issue with the methods or results of this paper. However the manuscript is not well organized and contains several grammatical and spelling errors. Most of the compulsory edits from my original report have been addressed, but generally not well.

Original compulsory edits

1. No information on the prevalence of under-nutrition is given.
   This has addressed fully

2. The discussion focuses on parasite infection, even though only one parasite is a significant predictor of one type of under-nutrition, indicating it is a false positive. The discussion on parasite infection needs to be shortened and restructured to better reflect the results. Also as the parasite discussion is now, it is piecemeal statements about other studies and does not have a narrative or “take away”/ conclusion.
   The discussion on parasite infection is unchanged.

3. The discussion on food insecurity needs to be expanded and moved to the beginning of the discussion. Food insecurity is the only predictor that significantly predicts all types of under-nutrition and therefore seems to be the driver factor for under-nutrition in this sample.
   This has been appropriately addressed

4. Line 110-120: Overall more information on what was contained in the questionnaire is needed. List all the topics that are used as predictors in the regression. Describe when the data is collapsed into categories (i.e. family size) and when pre-used categories were used (i.e. parental education(?))
   More information on the questionnaire has been included but is muddled since the statistical analysis information (regression) is contained within the same paragraph. Overall the statistical methods are scattered throughout the methods section, making it overly difficult to determine what analyses were done. Also there is no information on what the categories are.
5. Add a strengths and weaknesses section. This will allow a brief discussion of puberty, which was not measured.
A limitations section has been added that does not address puberty.

6. Much of the methods and descriptive results focuses on hygiene and cleanliness but these measures are abandoned for the regression. Either remove them from the manuscript or create a hygiene index (or something similar) and include it as a predictor in the regressions.
A hygiene index has been created but is only described in the Operational Definitions section.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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