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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor.

Thank you for your quick response and for considering this manuscript after our previous revision. We appreciate your helpful comments. We have now thoroughly gone through the manuscript and had it reviewed by a person fluent in English, to address grammatical and other writing issues. This letter includes our responses to your comments point by point, in addition to explanations of the general revisions to the manuscript regarding writing and grammar. Changes are also highlighted in yellow in the manuscript.
- lines 2-3 - contain should be plural

Response: This is changed to “contains” (line 2).

- lines 10-13: run on sentences that should be split up

Response: The sentence is now split up after “attention”, line 11, and after “general estimates equation” line 13.

We have also identified other long sentences, and split these up as well in lines:

41-42
51
116
252
288
362

- line 13 - recorded rather than registered?

Response: We agree, “registered” is now replaced by “recorded” in line 13 in the abstract, and in lines 115 and 367 in the manuscript.

- line 20 - reword 'doing omission errors'

Response: The sentence is changed in the abstract (lines 19-20) to “Omission errors decreased in the meat group compared to the fish group (Incidence rate ratio = 0.85; 95% CI: 0.74, 0.98).” It is also changed in the manuscript in lines 245, 280 and 320.

- line 22 - were should be was (or change 'there were' to 'we observed')

Response: We think the suggestion “we observed” was a very good one, and have accordingly changed the wording in line 22 and in line 377.
suggest finishing abstract with a more informative sentence (versus 'could be difficult to interpret' - can you state the nature of research needed to shed light on this?)

Response: We agree and have made the following changes:

- We have included this in the abstract (lines 24-26).
- A section in the discussion (lines 350-354) where we discuss the appropriateness of the RCT design in dietary interventions, and suggest that a prospective study design could be a good alternative.
- A sentence about this has also been included in the conclusion in the manuscript (lines 381-383).

- in younger children 'when' (as opposed to among whom or something along those lines)
Response: We have replaced “in younger children” with “in early childhood” (line 34).

- lines 44-47
Response: This section is rewritten (lines 45-49).

- line 49: performance should be singular
Response: This is changed accordingly (line 51).

General response:

We have had our manuscript reviewed by a person who is fluent in English, and have additionally rephrased these sentences:

- The sentence in line 47-49.
- The sentence in lines 259-260.
- The sentence in line 284-286.
- The beginning of the sentence in line 292.
- The word “relations” is changed to “association” in line 307.
- “seemed to have an effect” is changed to “seemed to be effective” in line 311-312.
- The sentence in lines 315-317.
- The sentence in lines 339-341.

In addition, new references have been inserted in line 35 and 122.