



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Nutrition &amp; Food Safety</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_EJNFS_35745</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>IEC (Information Education Communication) module as an effective tool for mitigation of iron deficiency anaemia among rural adolescent girls of Uttarakhand, India</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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/journal/30/editorial-policy>)



**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Statistical analysis should be revisited to provide for baseline differences between the experimental and control groups. Comments the baseline statistics and how it must have possibly influenced the outcome statistics should be provided in the text. Elaborate on the descriptive statistics.</li> <li>2. You should provide information on the significance of your KAP statistics as it is lacking for all the parameters. Information on how KAP values influenced hemoglobin level should be provided in the text, even where the KAP statistics is not significant. Elaborate on the study outcome in the discussion. Information on how the independent variables influenced the outcome of the dependent variable is need.</li> <li>3. Only two districts in one region of the state participated in the study. You should modify the title and content of the manuscript to reflect more of the region than the state.</li> <li>4. You should provide reasons for choosing the experiental and control groups from two different locations instead of doing a random allocation of the participants to either group.</li> <li>5. Provide appropriate references for your introductory statements.</li> <li>6. Check for grammatical errors throughout the text.</li> </ol>	<p>1. Statistical analysis has been revisited. Changes have been incorporated and highlighted in yellow color. Difference in baseline and end results of KAP and haemoglobin level were analysed for significance and incorporated in the text and table.</p> <p>2. Information pertaining to significance of KAP scores has already been given in the Table1. It is now added in the text and highlighted. Effect of IEC intervention on KAP and haemoglobin levels of the subjects has been elaborated in the results and discussion part.</p> <p>3. Title has been modified and highlighted.</p> <p>4. Different locations were selected so that control group would not be influenced by experimental group, or cross pollination would not occur. Subjects of both the locations had similar socioeconomic status and cultural background</p> <p>5. References have been incorporated in the text as well as in the references section and highlighted too.</p> <p>6. Grammatical errors have been rectified.</p> <p>Changes have been incorporated and highlighted</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	I have attached the text I worked on, with marks to guide you.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		