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**Author’s response to reviews:**

Responses from editorial comments

Thank you for your attention to the revisions requested by the reviewers. This is a well-written article addressing an important topic.

There are a few additional revisions required:

Authors’ responses: Thank you very much for this opportunity to revise our manuscript. Below are point-by-point responses to the comments raised.

If possible, provide more details and a reference for how you determined dietary diversity score - did you ask about consumption over 24 hours or 7 days? Did you use the FAO 2011 guidelines on measuring household and individual dietary diversity or another reference? Why did you define your groups the way you did - for example, you don't mention "green vegetables" in the methods when you explain how food groups were categorized, but then you report them out
separately in the results and table 1. Consider whether it is a limitation that you reported on a more limited set of food groups than is typically considered for dietary diversity assessment.

Authors’ response: Thank you very much for the comment. Dietary diversity score was calculated based on the data on recall of foods consumed in the previous 24 hours. The questionnaire had other questions that had asked same questions on whether or not participant consumed types of foods at question in the past seven days or one month. We did not use such data because of likelihood of recall bias. Although the questionnaire was not similar to the 2011 FAO guidelines and even FANTA DDS questionnaire, we used similar methods in categorizing food groups. In the ‘Methods’ Page 4, line 32-35 we mentioned that, ‘Food groups assigned were starch or carbohydrate, any protein, animal protein, plant protein, vegetables, and fruits. Categorical variables were made for each food groups as none, once, 2-3, and 4 and above times a day’. Vegetable in this context was mainly green leafy vegetables. We have therefore revised the text to include the word ‘green’ in our revised manuscript.

Because of the validity issues for this tool, we have include it as a limitation of the study in Page 8, line 29-31.

Ethical consideration: Please clarify in the article text that the parent study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the National Medical Research Institute (NIMR), Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences (MUHAS), and the Harvard School of Public Health. Also clarify whether the sentence: "They were assured of confidentiality and anonymity throughout the process and for all reports and publications generated" refers to the study participants, and whether the study participants provided written or verbal informed consent to participate in the parent study.

Authors’ response: We have made clarifications as commented in the respective sections in page 5 and 9.

In the last paragraph of "Descriptive characteristics according to nutritional status," the final sentence is incomplete: "There was no statistically significant difference in dietary diversity among those with undernutrition and their counterparts, however, a lower proportion of those with undernutrition (89.6% had not consumed any of the start..."

Authors’ response: We have revised the manuscript and corrected the typo