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Author’s response to reviews:

1. Editor Comments: All over the manuscript you should not state the cereals may affect the diet quality of infants and young children because in my opinion this statement is not supported by your findings. However, if you have the data to support this statement please add it in the results section or underline more clearly these data if you think that they have been already provided in the text.

Authors’ response: We have removed all such statements from the manuscript.

2. Editor Comments: Title: I think that your study is not able to clearly demonstrate that cereals as complementary food my affect diet quality of infants and young children in Ghana. In my opinion the title should be only descriptive: “Use of commercial infant cereals as complementary food in infants and young children in Ghana”

Authors’ response: Thank you. We have revised the title as suggested.

3. Editor Comments: Page 13, lines 21-23: please change “In spite of these limitations, our results have shed ample light on the use, consumption levels and how CIC use as complementary food among different age groups of IYC may affect diet quality of children in Ghana.” in “In spite of these limitations, our results have shed ample light on the use and consumption levels of CIC as complementary food among different age groups of children in Ghana”

Authors’ response: Thank you. We have revised this sentence as suggested.

Reviewer 1.
4. The authors now present average intake of micronutrients from CIC based on a single day recall (Table 5). I would, however, wonder if simply putting the average group intake of various nutrients would mean anything to readers, with no reference as to where exactly these intake levels fall. I would present RNI and/or %RNI for each nutrient (e.g. are the group intakes 50%, 70%...100% of the RNI for the specific age/sex?). RNI exist for 12-13 month age group but the authors may regroup the younger age groups based RNI recommendation. This provides some reference as to where the average intakes fall.

Authors’ response: We agree and have revised Table 5 to include percent RNI for each micronutrient. We have calculated the proportion of IYC whose micronutrient intake from CIC is at least 70% or less the RNI. We have therefore revised the abstract, methods and results sections to include this addition.

5. Reviewer’s comment: The authors could also compare group intakes between female and male children (which could tell if boys and girls are fed differently?) or groups intakes could be compared across other categorical variable that may affect amount of tablespoons of CIC consumed (other than child age of course).

Authors’ response: Thank you for the suggestion. We have not compared CIC intake by sex of IYC. The object of present study was to explore the CIC consumption levels among younger and older children which has been adhered to throughout the manuscript.