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Author’s response to reviews:

Date 11 Dec 2017
To: BMC Nutrition Editorial
From: Habtamu Temesgen
Subject: A letter accompanying 3rd Revision in Response to editor Comments

I am happy to resubmit the revised manuscript “Dietary diversity and associated factors among children aged 6–23months in Sinan Woreda, Northwest Ethiopia: A Cross-Sectional Study” after your fruitful comment and suggestions for publication in BMC nutrition Journal again. Your comment and suggestions are highly significant for the quality of our manuscript and we accept those comments and we tried to address all the comments and suggestions. In the following pages, we have addressed yours’ concerns in a point by point format by highlighting the response. Those points that addressed were indicated with track changed on the manuscript throughout the manuscript. Both corrected and the track changed manuscripts are attached on the resubmission to see the changes throughout the manuscript.

We look forward to receiving your decision.

With regards

Habtamu Temesgen

On the behalf of other authors.
Editor Comments:

1. The Background section still has very short paragraphs that should be combined - for example, paragraph 1 and paragraph 3 only have 3 sentences and paragraph 5 has 1 sentence. Please try to combine some of these paragraphs.

Author response: we admit the comment and tried to correct by including additional explanations to the paragraphs 1 and 3, and merging some of them (paragraph 4 and 5) together.

2. In the methods section there are too many subheadings. Keep "Study design and setting" and "Sample size determination and sampling procedure" then put "Data collection and measurements".

- What are the 7 groups - currently in the text you have the following "(grains, roots and tubers, legumes and nuts, dairy products (milk, yogurt, and cheese), flesh foods (meat, fish, poultry and liver/organ meats), eggs, vitamin-A rich fruits and vegetables, other fruits and vegetables)". This is not clear! Are all one group?

Author response: We thank the editor for enquiry of further explanation on the seven food groups on the definitions. Accordingly we clearly stated the seven food groups in the manuscript. Vitamin-A rich fruits and vegetables and other fruits and vegetables are not in one group according to the WHO guideline for DD in children age 6-23months. Those food groups are: (1) Grains, roots, and tubers, (2) Legumes and nuts, (3) Dairy products, (4) Flesh foods, (5) Eggs, (6) Vitamin-A rich fruits and vegetables, (7) Other fruits and vegetables. On page 6 under operational definition.

3. After the last sentence of the data collection and measurements section start a new paragraph to add the information about how you defined the dependent and independent variables?

Author response: We corrected as per the editor’s suggestion. We define the dependent variable on operational definition.

4. "The dependent variable was dietary diversity and was categorized as optimal or suboptimal. Dietary diversity was defined as optimal if children (aged 6-23 months) received foods from at least four of seven food groups (list the 7 food groups here - as currently written in the text, it is not clear what is included in the 7 groups, see below) within the previous 24 hours. Suboptimal was defined as receiving three foods or fewer. Independent variables
included socioeconomic and demographic characteristics, health utilization, behavioral factors, and child health characteristics."

Please note that you need to define some of the independent variables in this paragraph.

Author response: corrected on the Data collection procedure and measurements and operational definition section accordingly.

5. Change "Data processing and analysis" to "Statistical Analysis"

Author response: “Data processing and analysis” changed to “Statistical Analysis”

6. The information written under "Ethical considerations" can be moved up and incorporated into the paragraph about "Study design and setting". The sentence that says "Chance was given to ask..." should be changed to "All participants were allowed to ask questions throughout data collection and could refuse to answer questions or stop the interview at any moment."

Author response: “Ethical considerations” moved up and incorporated into the “Study design and setting”. “Chance was given to ask…” is re-phrased as “All participants were…” on page 4 under the study design and setting last paragraph.

7. In the Results section, you inconsistently report percentages using 0-2 decimal places. Please only report as whole numbers. So in the first paragraph you should write that the response rate was 99%. You can delete the following sentence "Four (0.54%) of the samples were excluded from the analysis due to incomplete response."

Author response: Corrected and numerical presentations of the result section expressed using 0 decimal places consistently throughout the result except the results for Odds ratio.

8. Make sure to change all of the percentages throughout the text.

Author response: We corrected that the percentages in the table and the figure are expressed using 0 decimal places.
9. If you use an acronym in the text like ANC, PNC you need to spell it out first. Please go through the text and look for these types of errors.

Author response: We corrected that all the acronyms first expressed in full texts.

10. You do not need to discuss the results from both the unadjusted and adjusted logistic regression models and you don’t need to re-report odds ratios in the text that are already shown in the tables. You also don't need to include the p values when you report the odds ratios in the text.

Author response: We deleted the adjusted odds ratio and the p-value from the text forms and deleted the bivariate results on result sections of factors associated with DD.

11. In the tables, you should specify that "Frequency" is n and "Percentage" is %.

In the figure, you need to report the percentages without the decimal places.

Author response: We modified the table by assigning the frequency for both Number and percentage then separated the rows of for the percentage and the number.

12. Remove the definitions for "Assisted delivery" and "Media exposure" - they are out of context here because you have yet to mention them anywhere in the text above.

Author response: We deleted the operational definitions for “Assisted delivery” and “Media exposure”.

13. BMC Nutrition operates a policy of open peer review, which means that you will be able to see the names of the reviewers who provided the reports via the online peer review system. We encourage you to also view the reports there, via the action links on the left-hand side of the page, to see the names of the reviewers.

Reviewer reports:

If improvements to the English language within your manuscript have been requested, you should have your manuscript reviewed by someone who is fluent in English. If you would like professional help in revising this manuscript, you can use any reputable English language editing service. We can recommend our affiliates Nature Research Editing Service (http://bit.ly/NRES_BS) and American Journal Experts (http://bit.ly/AJE_BS) for help with
English usage. Please note that use of an editing service is neither a requirement nor a guarantee of publication. Free assistance is available from our English language tutorial (https://www.springer.com/gb/authors-editors/authorandreviewertutorials/writinginenglish) and our Writing resources (http://www.biomedcentral.com/getpublished/writing-resources). These cover common mistakes that occur when writing in English.

------------------------
Editorial Policies
------------------------

Please read the following information and revise your manuscript as necessary. If your manuscript does not adhere to our editorial requirements, this may cause a delay while this is addressed. Failure to adhere to our policies may result in rejection of your manuscript.

In accordance with BioMed Central editorial policies and formatting guidelines, all manuscript submissions to BMC Nutrition must contain a Declarations section which includes the mandatory sub-sections listed below. Please refer to the journal's Submission Guidelines web page for information regarding the criteria for each sub-section (https://bmcnutr.biomedcentral.com/).

Where a mandatory Declarations section is not relevant to your study design or article type, please write "Not applicable" in these sections.

For the 'Availability of data and materials' section, please provide information about where the data supporting your findings can be found. We encourage authors to deposit their datasets in publicly available repositories (where available and appropriate), or to be presented within the manuscript and/or additional supporting files. Please note that identifying/confidential patient data should not be shared. Authors who do not wish to share their data must confirm this under this sub-heading and also provide their reasons. For further guidance on how to format this section, please refer to BioMed Central's editorial policies page (see links below).

Declarations
- Ethics approval and consent to participate
- Consent to publish
- Availability of data and materials
- Competing interests
- Funding

- Authors' Contributions

- Acknowledgements

Author response: We have checked for the adherence of this manuscript with the BioMed Central's editorial policies. Ethical approval and consent to participant has been addressed on the methods section and we omit on this part to avoid redundancy.