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Reviewer's report:

Great paper, thank you for the opportunity to review. Minor suggestions below:

43: Reference "In 2018, 1,281,260 children attended Early Childhood Education and Care (ECEC) services in Australia."

63-64: Consider defining the ADG’s and food groups here rather than further down in lines 63-64 to provide the reader with early clarification of guidelines.

97-99: Unclear here who will be using the data collection method. Assuming it's researchers but 'service level' may lead readers to assume the staff are weighing the food themselves.

99: Describe why this will be useful.

104: Different methodologies for what? Currently unclear.


174: Have no systematic reviews been done to assess FR accuracy and reliability in childcare? If not, potentially add this as a limitation.

232: Add Australia after Perth.

240: Currently slightly inconsistent with wording of services vs. centres. Suggest selecting one for consistency purposes. Use of centres in lines 240, 243, 248, 249, 277, 304, but services used in the rest of the paper.

264: Consider using research assistants for consistency instead of researcher assistants.

284: Describe as Microsoft Excel.

289: First mention of Foodworks except for in abstract. Suggest providing definition. E.g. Food and nutrient analysis software. Also, what version of foodworks (e.g. Foodworks 9).

292: Unclear at first why a 2.5 year old boy was chosen as a reference. Later explained in 306-308, but suggest providing explanation earlier for clarification.
296: Describe as Microsoft Access

298: First mention of discretionary foods. Suggest adding definition of discretionary foods and clarify how these foods were identified and classified (i.e. was it due to nutrient content? Previously established list of discretionary foods?)

309: Table 2: First mention of fat allowance. Unclear if this for total fat or just saturated fat? Suggest defining this earlier prior to the table or adding more detail in the footer ‘a’

339: Was the type of milk also noted by the researchers (e.g. full fat, reduced fat), or purely the weights?

358: Was the weight of the empty weight jug also recorded (and later subtracted). If so, consider adding this into the table.
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