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June 7, 2019

Editorial Office
BMC Nutrition

ATTN: Submission of Revised Research Article for publication in BMC Nutrition (NUTN-D-19-00017R2)

Dear Editorial Office,

Thank you for reviewing our manuscript, “Acceptability and utilization of a lipid-based nutrient supplement formulated for pregnant women in rural Niger: a multi-methods study” (NUTN-D-19-00017R2).

We are grateful to the reviewers for their minor comments received in this fourth review, all of which have been addressed in the revised version.

Thank you for the consideration of our work, and we look forward to hearing back from you.

Sincerely,
Editor Comments:

In addition to the reviewer's comments below, please address the following editorial concerns:

Comment 1. Clean version

At this stage, please upload a clean version of your manuscript, without any tracked changes or otherwise highlighted text, as this may interfere with the production process.

Response: As suggested, only a clean version of the revised manuscript has been uploaded with this submission.

Comment 2. Section headers

Please ensure your section headers adhere to our editorial guidelines

- Change "abbreviations" to "list of abbreviations"

Response: As suggested, the section header has been corrected to be “List of abbreviations" (line 366).

Comment 3. Conflicting declarations statement

In your conflicts of interest (CoI) you state "MZ had no role in data collection nor analysis of results presented" but in your author contributions you state "MZ and RFG contributed to the conception and design of the study, as well as interpretation of data." Please clarify if MZ was or was not involved in the analysis/interpretation of the data. Please note that it is not a problem if a researcher with CoI is involved in the data analysis/interpretation, as long as their CoI has been clearly presented in the declarations.

Response: We confirm that author MZ had no role in the statistical analysis of results presented, however, once the results were tabulated, MZ did contribute to their interpretation. To clarify that MZ did not participate in the statistical analysis only the interpretation of results, we have
clarified the conflict of interest statement to read as follows (lines 387-388): “MZ had no role in data collection or statistical analysis of results.” We also corrected the author contribution statement to read as follows (lines 398-399): “MZ and RFG contributed to the conception and design of the study, as well as interpretation of final results.”

Reviewer reports:

Susana Matias (Reviewer 1):

Comment: The authors have responded to my comments and made necessary revisions. There is one issue though that may still need to be addressed. See my comment below with respect to the authors’ response and revision per one of my previous comments.

Standard deviations are not used to calculate Confidence Intervals (CIs), but standard errors are. With that clarified, CIs should not be used to determine statistical significant differences. In general, the word "significant" is used to describe the rejection of the null hypothesis after conducting statistical testing. Therefore, the revision proposed by the authors could be misleading for the reader. I suggest rewording the text to something like this: "As shown in Table 3, there do not seem to be variation in results…"

Response: The reviewer’s comment is understood to suggest removing use of the term “significant” when not conducting statistical testing.

As suggested, we have revised the text to remove the term “significant” at this mention when a statistical test was not conducted. The updated text now reads as follows (lines 217-218): “There was no meaningful variation in results between days (day 1 vs. day 2) or between time periods (June (Ramadan