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Reviewer's report:

Methods

How were the FGD guides developed? How many questions did it include? Did someone evaluate them before usage? Explain more how you conducted the FGDs? Who facilitated them, how the facilitators managed the interviews or FGDs?

About food diversity, explain more about method of diversity calculation, i.e. how many categories or food groups did you consider for measuring Diet Diversity. Did you use consumed foods as servings or not, did you consider all foods or you selected some of them. What dietary assessment tool did you use? I mean 24-h recall or food record or FFQ?

Result

In tables 1 and 2 it is preferred to write percentage(%) rather than Proportions.

Discussion

You mentioned the findings of the current study somehow contradicted the empirical norm on the matter of education, please explain more about the finding. What is your interpretation? Why does it contradict other findings in your idea?

You mentioned" the shorter the distance (<5km), the more the services that were utilized". However, I think that was not a general rule, because in table 3, having distance facility less than 1 km was less likely to utilize critical services and products compared to a distance of 1-5km.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No
Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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