SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

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)

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	**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.** **Analyzing changes after 3-months, each change should be evaluated, whether it is statistically significant, therefore p values are required.**	
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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Tomasz Powrózek***
Department, University & Country	***Medical University of Lublin, Poland***