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Reviewer’s report:

The present manuscript is a cross-sectional study designed to assess the nutritional knowledge, attitudes and practices of primary school children in Nairobi city, Kenya. Given the interest in nutrition transition, this manuscript offers an insight into the nutritional understanding of children in a developing country undergoing an increasing exposure to processed foods. Although interesting, the manuscript would benefit from more robust scientific methodology and interpretation of results in the discussion. Major and minor comments are detailed below:

Major:

1. The methods section requires considerably more detail. No references to previously used tools are provided. For example, on line 74 the authors state that the questionnaire is validated, yet no details on how this was done are provided. In addition, the results section includes a lot of information on the design and scoring of questionnaires that should be moved to the methods section. Can the authors comment on the effectiveness of assessing nutritional knowledge using these 10 questions and on the rationale for the other questionnaires? It would be useful to know if these were based on a previously published questionnaires, which would improve the scientific credibility of the methods. If these questionnaires were designed specifically for the study then this should be stated and the questionnaires provided in supplementary material.

2. The discussion requires considerable revision to include a opening paragraph detailing the aims and main findings, more discussion, references and comparisons to similar studies and the addition of strengths and limitations.

Minor:

Line 45: Throughout the text there are examples of when studies are referenced incorrectly in the text and line 45 is the first example of this issue. Please insert either the author's name eg. 'Smith et al.' or say 'a recent study'.

Line 58: It is not clear what the authors mean by a 'negative attitude'. Please elaborate.
Line 74: As mentioned as a major comment, the authors should either provide a reference to the validation of the questionnaire, or if unpublished, provide details of how it was validated and briefly how well it performed.

Line 74-75: It is not evident from the methods how these assessments were carried out so further details are required. E.g. how was the focus group structured?

Line 77: Table 2 should be referenced.

Line 91: SPSS should be fully referenced and a P value stated that results were considered significant at.

Line 100: Rationale for why these three groups/cut offs were chosen should be provided.

Line 125: Can the authors elaborate in the methods on whether these were open ended or multiple choice questions? In either case the authors should insert a column in the table to identify what the correct answer was considered to be. It would be beneficial to include the questionnaires in the supplementary material.

Line 137: FGD is already defined.

Line 144: Details of the FFQ should be provided in the methods section.

Line 146: Please define FANTA.

Line 149: The title of this table should be re-written as the food groups include more than just sweetened beverages and junk food. Can the authors please elaborate on where these results are from? I.e. whether they are from the FFQ.

Line 161: It is not clear to the reader which part of the results refer to which questionnaire. Please refer to Tables and questionnaire names in each paragraph of the results.

Line 175-182: If these data are from the focus groups this should be clarified.

Line 188: A more detailed Table title should be included. Furthermore, the authors previously referred to 'smokies' and 'sausages' as one and the same thing (line 158). The authors should be consistent with their terminology throughout the manuscript.

Line 221: Table 6 title does not correspond with the contents. The authors should revise this.

Line 236: This reference style is inconsistent with the rest of the manuscript.
Line 240: This table is very confusing and hard to read. Column headings should be added for 'X2', 'df' and 'p-value' and a more appropriate table title should be provided. Table 7 should also be referenced in the text.

Line 252: The discussion would benefit from a clearer opening paragraph highlighting the aims and main findings of the study.

Line 253: This reference style is inconsistent with the rest of the manuscript.

Line 255: This should be 'influences' and 'in' should be removed.

Line 260: 'The' should be added before 'fact'.

Line 264: These are already defined.

Line 274: The authors should clarify what they mean by 'this'

Line 288: The authors need to highlight the strengths and limitations of the study.

Line 292-293: Repetition of 'main'

Line 299: This point should be elaborated on in the discussion and references to studies on the adequacy of nutritional knowledge provided.

Line 320: The fact that only 13 references are provided highlights the lack of scientific footing in this manuscript. The authors are recommended to revisit the introduction, methods and discussion to better substantiate their manuscript. I would expect to see at least double this number of references.
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