



**SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM**

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>There are lot of issue which have not been pointed out by reviewers which I believe need to be dealt with and edited:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide study design first in methods</li> <li>2. Results: when your eligibility criteria is 6-12 years why is there a wide difference in distribution of children in 8-12 and less than 8 years. Also the distribution of children in 1-3 standard and 4-6 are almost equal but not age group. Clarify in methods or discussion</li> <li>3. In table 1: age has been wrongly written 5-8</li> <li>4. What were the criteria to categorise the income, also provide last category in income group in table 2.</li> <li>5. Fig 1 is wrongly made, use component bar graph. With male, female as components of underwt, obesity, overweight.</li> </ol> <p>You have discussed that various predictors decide the nutrition status, but not presented it in results. No bivariate tables present with nutrition as dependent and other variables as independent variable.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Study design has been provided.</li> <li>2. Has been clarified in discussion, as highlighted in yellow.</li> <li>3. Age distribution has been corrected.</li> <li>4. Last category for income has been added, criteria also included as footnote in table 2 as highlighted in yellow.</li> <li>5. Fig 1 has been adjusted appropriately.</li> </ol> <p>Nutritional status which is the dependent variable has been presented in a graph format; the independent variables have also been presented in tables 1 - 3.</p>