



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_27752
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the performance of out-patient malnutrition management in children under 5 years in Benin rural setting
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 <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	This looks like a cross sectional study rather than evaluation study. So it is better to remove the word of evaluation. Lot of spelling mistake in the abstract and paper to be corrected.	Authors would sincerely like to thank Reviewer for his relevant and useful comments. Please find below the changes to the manuscript according the raised concerns The study design is revised accordingly
	Current research area available with UNICEF on coverage of SAM management and the assessments, better to include it for references and add few sentences in the introduction. E.g. 1. Ernest Guevarra ¹ , Alison Norris, Saul Guerrero, Mark Myatt; Assessment of Coverage of Community-based Management of Acute Malnutrition; CMAM FORUM Technical Brief July 2012 Version 2: September 2014 2. http://files.ennonline.net/attachments/2348/SAM-Bottleneck-Monitoring-Toolkit_Summary.pdf 3. Myatt, Mark et al. 2012. Semi-Quantitative Evaluation of Access and Coverage (SQUEAC)/Simplified Lot Quality Assurance Sampling Evaluation of Access and Coverage (SLEAC) Technical Reference. Washington, DC: FHI 360/FANTA.	The three references are cited in section Introduction
	Line 54 – most appropriate to change it to assess rather than evaluate	The objective is revised accordingly in section 2. Objective



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 64 – “Agricultural productions are based on maize, yam, beans and” – what is the link, if you want to mention this please try to link it to the study.	This link is to elaborate on feeding habits of the population regarding malnutrition
	Line 75 – More towards cross sectional study than evaluation	The study design is revised accordingly
	Line 76 – it looks like child malnutrition not infant and may not be study patients, it may be study subjects	“Study patients”, is replaced with “study subjects”
	Line 83-85 – sample selection is not clear to exclude the selection bias. Better to give clear details.	The sample included 02 doctors, 30 health workers, 01 social worker, and fourteen community volunteers. Community volunteers selected were the first met in the villages. The sampling technique were not at random and consisted to: - Purposive or reasoned choice - Convenience choice. Possible biases associated are discussed in limitations section at the end of Discussion
	Line 90 – repeat word of performance	The repeated word is deleted
	Line 163 – 169 – most of data is collected through records. Therefore it is needed to clarify the accuracy of reports to keep the validity of findings. Usually these routine records are not valid as survey data collections. Please Add few lines how you validated the routine data.	Data we collected through record concerned 296 children followed in 2013. We don’t validate the accuracy of routine data. We elaborate on this in section of limitation at the end of discussion. Data on “input/resources” and “process” were collected through interviews and direct observations
	Results section depend on the validity of routine data. Please strengthened that section.	We elaborate on this at the beginning of section discussion
	Discussion: Better to discuss in relation to impact also. Drop out may be due to non-availability of RUTF in clinics. Better to go	Drop out are discussed in discussion section



SDI Review Form 1.6

	through your data to describe it in the discussion in addition to describing travel time etc. non availability of culinary facilities – it may be related to low weight gain it seems that children are given local food with RUTF and the non-nutritive factors must be playing there. Better to discuss little bit more	
	Conclusion: it is not related to the findings of the study. Please rewrite it considering the results.	Conclusion is rephrased to link it to the findings of the study.
	References: Most are in French. Better to use few English leading papers. Few are given above.	The above references are used in the introduction with thanks. We added other references in English
	Line 176: Please add the ethical clearance number with the year.	After study objectives have been explained to participants, we get just voluntary free and informed oral consent from participants before starting the interview.
	Line 173: do not see data which are analysed in STATA tables that are presented need very little analysis.	We use STATA just to estimate the proportions. This is obviously very little analysis. It was in link of our objectives.
	Observation of activities of field workers needs to be taken ethical clearance from the standard ethical committee.	We get just consent of health workers. After study objectives have been explained to participants, we get just voluntary free and informed oral consent from participants before starting the interview.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		