Response to reviewer 1 comments

Dear reviewer,

thank you for your interest and for taking the time to review the manuscript.
Your suggestions helped us to further strengthen our review. Please find our response below in blue. In the word document we used track changes, to indicate our alterations.
Kind regards

This review is of interest. Yet it can be further improved.

First, it would be useful to provide further details on the rationale of selecting 200 as the starting point for the literature review: sentence 93-95 arenot clear.
These sentences were re-written to explain in more detail why 2008 was chosen as a starting point (lines 95-100). Previous literature research (up to 2008) was performed for the national guidelines of the Dutch Health Council. Our literature search was developed to identify the studies which were publishes since then.

Second, with regard to the presentation of the result, it might be good to also incude the followings:
- Studies characteristics: dietary assessment methods, location type of design (RCT, longitudinal, other)
- Risks of biais: studies quality
- Participant characteristics: age of women, parity, gender of children and age, etc.
An then, finish the results section with the description of outcomes (food, consumption, nutrient intake, etc.). It might be good to present data in children based on their breastfeeding status.
The assessment method, and information on the validation can be found in tables 1 and 2. We have added the type of design to tables 1 and 2. The scope of the manuscript was to identify studies which contain nutritional data, however we did not analyze the nutritional data itself. It is of interest to do these type of analyses in future research, in which additional population characteristics should be taken into account. Additional characteristics information was extracted, and is available for researches upon request. To address the quality of the studies in our current review, we extracted a.o. the year of data collection, the assessment methods and information on the validation of this method. In addition, we identified multiple publications on the same study. These factors are discussed in the discussion section. We added an additional comment on de aspect of self-reporting in the discussion (lines 302-304), as this may influence the outcome (intake data) quality. In case of future data-analyses, based on our findings, additional aspects such as participant recruitment should be taken into account.

In Table 1, it would be useful to have a column on the type of the study`s design.
Thank you for this suggestion, we have added this information to tables 1 and 2.

The discussion should be reviewed accordingly and be more organized.
We have added subheadings to improve the readability of the discussion section.

The English language of the text requires major revisions.

Several adaptations were made throughout the manuscript. Based on the overall comments of reviewers I and II (i.e. English language is fine, moderate changes required), and the limited time before re-submission, no extensive English revision was made by a native-speaker.