



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_48256
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact study of institutional food supplementation on nutritional status of pre-school children
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>It is hard to rate the results because the group is heterozygous. First of all, authors divided children into subgroups according to dwelling. In MM section "where 60 children from the age group of 3-4 years, 20 children from 4-5 years, 20 children from 5-6 years were randomly selected from urban and semi-urban pre-schools..." How many children in particular group of age were in urban and semi-urban groups? It could be a disproportion, therefore using chi square test it should be checked. Such disproportion can affect result, e.g. differences in chest and head circumferences were significant, however, younger or older children in one of the groups may be responsible for this results. There, I suggest to clear this issue and appropriately divide patients into groups, prior to check the fit between those.</p> <p>Analyzing changes after 3-months, each change should be evaluated, whether it is statistically significant, therefore p values are required.</p>	<p>How many children in particular group of age were in urban and semi-urban groups? Ans. A sample size of 100 pre-school children (3-6 years) were selected for the study (50 children from urban and 50 children from semi-urban school), where 60 children from the age group of 3-4 years (30 children from urban and 30 children from semi-urban school), 20 children from 4-5 years (10 children from urban and 10 children from semi-urban school), 20 children from 5-6 years (10 children from urban and 10 children from semi-urban school) were randomly selected from urban and semi-urban pre-schools of Dharwad.</p> <p>It could be a disproportion, therefore using chi square test it should be checked. Such disproportion can affect result, e.g. differences in chest and head circumferences were significant, however, younger or older children in one of the groups may be responsible for this results. There, I suggest clearing this issue and appropriately dividing patients into groups, prior to check the fit between those. Ans. We didn't went in depth to assess the age wise malnutrition, our main objective is to assess the nutritional status of pre-school children, so we consider 30 children from 3-4 years, 10 children from 4-5 years and another 10 children from 5-6 years in each school. To make sure that, all age group children were randomly selected in pre-school group. Please kindly consider this.</p> <p>Analyzing changes after 3-months, each change should be evaluated, whether it is statistically significant, therefore p values are required. Ans: We mentioned the p values, where ** indicates $p < 0.001$, so it is highly significant and * indicates $p < 0.05$, so it is significant. Which is mentioned in results.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	-	
Optional/General comments	-	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	