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Author’s response to reviews:

October 7th, 2019
Editor-in-Chief
BMC Nutrition
Reference: Submission of a research article to be considered for publication in BMC Nutrition

Dear Editor,

We are writing to respectfully submit the revisions of our manuscript, according to the reviewer’s comments, entitled “Intrahousehold perception and management of nutritional supplements during the hunger gap in Niger: a qualitative study” to be considered for publication in BMC Nutrition.

We appreciate your consideration of our manuscript, and look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,
Caroline Marquer
Epicentre
Tel: +33 1 40 21 54 63
E-mail: caroline.marquer@epicentre.msf.org

Response to reviewer 1
1. The revised manuscript is much better, with a highly relevant discussion. The contrasts across products regarding perceptions and uses could have been clearer
Response: We thank the reviewer for this comment and for the overall revision of our manuscript.

Responses to reviewer 3
To our understanding and after a careful reading of the comments and of the manuscript we found that
the paper has improved a lot and answered most of the concerns of previous reviewers. This is an interesting paper, nicely written.
Response : We thank the reviewer for this comment.
1. I would suggest to enclose one table summarizing the pro and contra points of the three nutritional supplements.
Response : We agree with the reviewer and we added a table (Table 2.)
2. I would also suggest to add a perspective section in discussion section taking into account the main results of the study.
Response : We added a sentence in the discussion section.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

3. There are some repetition of words in abstract such as qualitative that you may delete.
Response : We removed the repetition in the abstract.
4. Three sentences are very similar in introduction section, one would be sufficient line 16, 30, 41. Lines 16 and 55..
Response : We thank the reviewer for his comment and we revised the introduction section accordingly.
5. Line 53: To our knowledge… this term is not really appropriate in a scientific paper
Response : We removed the sentence.
6. Page One line 32 and 40. Please introduce before the 3 different products
Response : We thank the reviewer for his comment, we added a paragraph to introduce the 3 supplements used in this study.
7. Please add more specific key words such as malnutrition..children.. supplements.
Response : We added additional key words.
8. The timing between distribution and the study should be clarified in methods.
Response : We thank the reviewer for his comment and we added clarification in the method section.
9. These villages were purposefully selected based on their diversity in terms of population size, location, access and distance to healthcare facilities and marketplaces. Please be more precise : what did you do ?
Response : We thank the reviewer and added this information.
10. "We keep it up to 30 minutes without any change of color or that it becomes liquid as water, after 30 minutes it is less concentrated". SC+
I do not understand this sentence ; please revise
Response : We revised the sentence accordingly.