**Reviewer 1**

I am happy with the revisions. I still feel the figures need a little bit of work to be made more visually appealing and intelligible without detailed reading of the notes. I also really like supplemental figure S1, and I wonder whether it should be in the main manuscript.

**R:** Thank you for your positive report.We have revised all main text figures to improve aesthetics and reduce dependence on legends. We have also split Figure 1 into two figures, and now include 3 species’ panels from supplementary Figure S1.

**Reviewer 2**

Abstract:   
"Dried fish consumption rates were 54% higher than fresh fish and highest in households near to marine coastlines. Dried fish consumption was higher than fresh fish almost everywhere, particularly for poor households and those near inland waterbodies or urban centres" 

Significance Statement:   
"we estimate that dried fish is 54% higher than fresh fish consumption" 

This wording is ambiguous and misleading - If I hadn't read the response to my comment I would have taken this to mean that the amount of dried fish consumed in Africa is 54% higher than the amount of fresh fish, and that the amount for dried fish consumed is higher than amount of fresh fish almost everywhere. Having read the authors' response to my comment, I now understand that this means that either the frequency of reported DF consumption is higher than FF, or the % of HH reporting DF consumption is higher than the % reporting FF consumption. Or perhaps it means that the share HH reporting consuming fish is 54 percentage points higher than the share consuming fresh? Please express this in a way that is completely transparent for the reader. This is a key takeaway from the paper and will probably be quoted widely by others so it's essential that there is no room for misinterpretation.

**R:** This is a key result from our study and we thank you for your suggestions to define more clearly. This finding refers to dried fish being eaten by 54% more people than eat fresh fish. We have now clarified this throughout the manuscript:

Abstract: “*Dried fish consumption was more prevalent than fresh fish, reaching 54% more people, particularly those in poor households and near to marine coastlines or urban centres.*”

Significance statement: “…*we estimate that dried fish reach one-third of households and are consumed by more people than fresh fish.”*

Main text: “…*we estimate that dried fish is consumed (weekly) by up to 144 million people [95% HPDI: 132-155 million] in Côte D’Ivoire, Malawi, Nigeria, Senegal, Tanzania, and Uganda,* ***reaching 54% more people*** *than fresh fish (weekly fresh fish consumption by 94 million people, 95% HPDI: 85-103 million).*” (L325)

On rereading the manuscript, I find the use of the term "fish consumption" throughout confusing, since the paper does not report quantities of fish consumed, but rather the share of HH consuming fish within past the 7 days. For example, the sentences such as "We next extracted information on fish consumption", "Fish consumption also decreased as travel time to urban centres increased", and "Fish consumption varied strongly among countries and between dried and fresh form" can easily be misread as referring to the amount of fish consumed. It would be more appropriate to preface the word "consumption" with frequency/likelihood/propensity or some similar term throughout.

**R:** We used‘fish consumption’ as shorthand for the model response variable (presence of household fish consumption in previous 7 days). We agree this could be misinterpreted. We have revised our text on the LSMS household diet surveys to refer only to the **prevalence of fish consumption** (when talking broadly about the results) and the **probability of fish consumption** (when talking specifically about model predictions). We have also clarified that our results relate to weekly, household consumption, and that households are *more* or *less likely* to consume fish (rather than *consumed more*, which implies quantities). These revisions are throughout the section *Drivers of household-level dried fish consumption* (L217).

It's also not obvious why the authors decided not to analyze quantities consumed - as this data is drawn from LSMS consumption modules, it seems that information must exist. It would have been a valuable addition to the paper. Please state explicitly somewhere around the bottom of p6 that the following analysis presents information on share of HH consuming within past 7 days, and does not present any information on the quantity of fish consumed, and explain why.

**R:** Thank you for raising this issue. We agree that this would have been a valuable addition, but we were unable to standardize the reporting of quantities and units across country surveys. For example, surveys in Malawi and Uganda used units in whole fish or heaps (small, medium, large), and Malawi provided unit conversions to grams. Units for Tanzania were grams or kilograms, but units for Côte D’Ivoire, Nigeria, and Senegal were cup, carton, sachet, or piece, and LSMS did not provide unit weights. For example, in Nigeria, 94% of fish quantity records were one small heap or piece. This limitation led us to develop an approach based on the prevalence of fish consumption.

We have added these points to the bottom of p6 and more detail in Methods:

L228: “*Food consumption surveys in LSMS recorded the consumption of fresh and dried (sun-dried or smoked) by each household in the preceding seven days, which we used to quantify prevalence of fresh and dried fish consumption. Surveys also recorded fish quantities but, as most surveys used semi-quantitative units, we were unable to estimate the quantity of fish consumption across the full dataset (Methods).*”

L515: “*These surveys recorded whether households consumed dried or fresh fish in the previous seven days, which we used to estimate the prevalence of fish consumption, assigning each household a 1 (dried or fresh fish consumption) or 0 (no dried or fresh fish consumption). Surveys also recorded the quantity of fish consumed, but food quantity units were typically semi-quantitative, such as cup, heap, piece, or whole fish, and thus we were unable to standardize quantities across all country datasets.”*

L225: "Across the six countries, 36-87% of households consumed fish and, of those, 24-67% consumed sun-dried or smoked forms". Please also state what % consumed fresh, as these overlap with DF consumers.

**R:** We have added % fresh to this sentence (L231) and a new column in Table S2 for % fresh fish by country. We have corrected Table S2 to show the proportion of all households consuming fish (rather than proportion of fish-consuming households), as this is clearer to communicate.