Response to reviewer II comments

Dear reviewer,
thank you for your interest in our manuscript and for taking the time to review the manuscript.
We appreciate your suggestions, and made several improvements. Please find our response below in blue. In the word document we used track changes, to indicate our alterations.
We hope that our manuscript will add to the knowledge, and future developments, in the field of nutrition during the first 1000 days of life.
Kind regards

Dear Editor,
Thank you for the opportunity to review the manuscript titled "Food consumption, nutrient intake, and status during the first 1000 days of life in the Netherlands: a systematic review". I read the manuscript with much enthusiasm as this manuscript addresses an essential gap in the area of food and nutrient consumption. Although multiple articles are available on food nutrient intakes of different groups of populations, a comprehensive review could provide an overall view and identify the missing links in this area. I have a few suggestions to the authors:

Line number 43. Women in affluent countries are often low in their iodine intakes also. Addition of Iodine to the list of nutrients mentioned would be valuable.
We have added iodine to the list of potential inadequate nutrients among pregnant women (line 44).

Line number 45: The intake of Omega 3 fatty acids are essential as well. The consumption of Omega 3 fatty acids through supplement use reported being higher among populations from the West.
Omega 3 fatty acids are essential for the development of the child. Based on your remark, it is unclear whether there is a potential inadequacy, or a risk of over-consumption through supplement intake. Therefore, we decided to restrict the examples of excessive intakes to vitamin A.

Line number 89-90: PRISMA is a reporting guideline for systematic reviews and not a guideline for conducting systematic reviews. The statement needs to be corrected.
Thank you for this correction. We have adapted the sentence, stating that the review was reported following the PRISMA guideline (lines 91-92).

Authors have not mentioned whether they had used any software for data extraction and analysis. Please state a line in this regards.
To manage our references, we used EndNote X9. The study characteristics were recorded in Microsoft Excel. We have added this information in lines 138-139. No data-analyses were performed using statistical software.

Authors have mentioned that two independent researchers completed the abstract, title selection. It would be good to indicate how authors addressed the disagreements when two of the researchers could not conclude on a particular study selection.
In case we did not agree on the inclusion of an article, we contacted a third reviewer. This information was included in de method section, we have rewritten the sentences (lines 123-124) to give it more emphasis.

How did the authors assess the quality of the studies included in the review? Even if it is a narrative review, it is relevant to have the quality of data evaluated before deriving the conclusions. Quality of systematic reviews increases with the appropriate use of the defined protocols. If the quality of the included studies is not assessed, this could lead to misinterpretation of data.
The quality of the studies is indeed essential for the interpretation of the data. The scope of our literature research was to identify studies which could provide nutritional data. The identified studies were mainly observational cohort studies and case-control studies, to emphasize this, we added the type of study in tables 1 and 2. It would be interesting to perform additional research on the nutritional data itself, in which a full quality assessment should be included (such as the Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment scale).
To address the quality of the studies in our current review, we extracted 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. We describe these factors 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.
Hopefully these alterations will help the reader with their interpretation of the identified studies.

Authors may include the types of studies they have used- for example, observational, cross-sectional, cohort or any other- of the studies they have included in the systematic review.
We have added this information in tables 1 and 2.