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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr López-Coronado,

Assistant Editor
Journal of the BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making

We sincerely thank the reviewers for their thoughtful review of the manuscript. The suggestions offered by the reviewers have been immensely helpful and their inputs are very helpful for improving the manuscript. We agree with all their comments and we have revised our manuscript accordingly. We are confident that the new version of the manuscript will be greatly improved. We respond below in detail to each of the reviewer’s comments. We hope that the reviewers will find our responses to their comments satisfactory.

Please see below, our detailed response after each comment. For more clearance, we have highlighted the corrections in the manuscript file.

Looking forward hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Bahlol Rahimi
PhD in Medical Informatics
Health Information Technology Department
(Reviewer 1):

There is needed to classify the related studies with every method and determine the weaknesses of these studies to be clear for the reader. Then give your opinion about these studies.

Authors’ Response: Thank you! We found your comments extremely helpful and have now extracted the weaknesses and strengths from the included articles and attached them in to the table (1). In Discussion part, we have explained our opinions about some weakness points which had been forgotten to indicate.

(Reviewer 2):

This paper presents a systematic review of recent mobile health applications for tackling the problem of malnutrition among preschool children. The reviewer has some several concerns on the work regarding methodology and paper writing.

1- Search strategy needs to be clarified so that the review can be repeated. For example, the reason for paper exclusion in screening and eligibility criteria in Fig. 1 are not elaborated. The time window for literature searching is not clear. The number of papers obtained by manual search is not provided. It is desirable that the authors provide their review protocol if it exists.

Authors’ Response: We are grateful for these valuable comments. The number of manually obtained papers and the reason for paper exclusion in screening and eligibility criteria have been corrected in figure 1. To access almost all the related studies in our review domain we had not considered any date restriction for literature searching and so according to the comments, this is also included in the Search strategy section.

2- In Sec. 2.2, I guess parentheses are required for MeSH terms, i.e. ("Child Nutrition Disorder" OR ... OR "Pediatric Feeding Disorder") AND ("Mobile Applications" OR ... OR "portable software app").

Authors’ Response: We agree with the reviewer and have amended the mentioned section.

3- It would be better for the authors to summarize and clarify their findings from the selected literature in the part of Results in the abstract.

Authors’ Response: We agree with the reviewer and have amended the abstract. But as results were diverse so we could to mention the result classification only and so it is not detailed.
4- I am interested in the distinguishing characters of m-health intervention for preschool children and general population besides mothers’ perspectives and behavior.

Authors’ Response: We appreciate your comments very much. As you recommended, we have attended the new explanations to the end of discussion part.

5- I strongly recommend a proofreading of the paper to correct grammatical and writing errors. I just list a couple here.

Authors’ Response: We agree, and have revised the text as per the reviewer’s suggestion.