

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_91160
Title of the Manuscript:	OUTPATIENT THERAPEUTIC PROGRAMME FOR MALNOURISHED CHILDREN
Type of the Article	Review 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:

(<https://www.journalajpr.com/index.php/AJPR/editorial-policy>)

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 seems to me that this article is more suitable for a chapter of a book or even as a professional paper, where the author introduce the OTP as a valid approach of a community-based management of acute malnutrition, than a review paper.</p> <p>In my opinion, to be a review paper it would have a different approach. It should provide a comprehensive foundation on the topic, but also identify gaps in existing studies for future research.</p> <p>I suggest to start with a brief definition/ types of acute malnutrition and types of approaches (inpatients vs outpatient). Then, mention the advantages/ disadvantages of the OTP as one of the main approaches of programmes of community based therapeutic care.</p> <p>At this point, the authors should be able to include the most recent/ important studies that corroborate or not the statements.</p> <p>Finally, the manuscript should ended with a conclusion and some ideas for future research. At the end, the readers should be elucidated about the effectiveness of the OTP as an approach of community-based management of acute malnutrition in children, what works best and worst and what should be done to improve.</p> <p>Also, it is not clear what the scope of this review is: the OTP approach or the Ready to Use therapeutic Food (the history of RUTF only makes sense to be in the article if this is the main topic)? Or do the authors wanted to make a critical approach about the RUTF in the OTP protocols? The text must be consistent with the title and in this paper, is not clear.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>Along the text, the word "programmeme" should be replaced by "programme"</p> <p>There are same acronyms without description, namely SFP and CFR</p>	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Liliane Costa
Department, University & Country	Portugal