

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JOCAMR_99307</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>CONSUMPTION COMPLIANCE SUPPLEMENTARY FOOD BISCUITS FOR PREGNANT WOMEN IN BANDA ACEH</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Systematic Review</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:

(<https://www.journaljocamr.com/index.php/JOCAMR/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory REVISION comments</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p><b>FIRST OF ALL, I'M HAPPY TO BE INVITED TO REVIEW THIS MANUSCRIPT. Thank you for the opportunity</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Yes. The manuscript is could be important for scientific community IF THE RESULTS ARE ANALYSED AGAIN IN A SCIENTIFICALLY SOUND WAY. However, the type of article the authors selected on the submission (systematic review" does not match the manuscript type received. The authors should select "research article" from type of the article section on resubmission of the manuscript.</b></li> <li>2. <b>Yes, but it would be better if the authors modify the title as "compliance to consumption of supplementary food Biscuits among pregnant women in Banda Aceh"</b></li> <li>3. <b>The abstract section:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <b>the abstract lacks statement describing the gap in the problem under study.</b></li> <li>b. <b>The objective of the study is not clearly stated which makes measurement of the outcome difficult.</b></li> <li>c. <b>Unexplained abbreviations were used in the abstract. Eg, PMT, MT, KEK</b></li> <li>d. <b>The findings of the study were not well described. Outcome variable (which could be consumption compliance) is not stated.</b></li> <li>e. <b>The authors fail to conclude their results and forward recommendations based on the result they found.</b></li> <li>f. <b>Sample size of 5 is too small to draw inference for the study population.</b></li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p><b>Introduction section:</b> The introduction is well informative, and provide scientifically sound evidence. <b>Editorial:</b> Line 4 of introduction section. "A person will be motivated to follow therapy because of the <i>benefits and benefits</i>"??? Supplementary feeding is abbreviated as PMT??? Chronic Energy Deficiency was abbreviated as CHD??? PSG??? Recheck it. <b>Please include a summary paragraph/statement describing the aim/objective of your study.</b></p> <p><b>Methods</b> <b>Subtheme 2.1. rename the title name into 'study design' .</b> Rewrite your study design clearly. The research method used in this study is mixed method. An explanatory sequential study design was employed. ... and please clearly state that which quantitative study design was employed. What are the objectives that were planned to be met with the quantitative and qualitative studies? Was the study community based OR facility/institution based?</p> <p><b>2.2. Location and time of the research---rename as "study area and period"</b> Describe more about your study setting. Specify the exact starting and end time of the study.</p> <p><b>2.3. Population and sample:</b> state your source population and study population. Did the authors set any eligibility criteria (inclusion and exclusion criteria). The sample size utilized for analysis, the sampling technique used... should be described. Dear authors would you please describe about your data collection tool? The reliability and validity of instrument, the source of the instrument or development process. How would the authors see the ethical aspects/confidentiality of collecting personal identifiers like name of the participants? The authors didn't describe how they use cross tabulation. How did you categorize your outcome variable? <b>For qualitative:</b> The two (a &amp; b) groups stated by the authors as the data source were the same. If your data collection method was in-depth interview, what was the intention of grouping? How was the sample size for the qualitative study determined? The authors are</p>	

required to define some naming like puskesmas, posyandu cadres... Please describe the specific data analysis method you applied for the qualitative study rather than describing the general things. Thematic content analysis.

**Result Section: THE AUTHORS NEED TO REVISE THE ANALYSIS AGAIN.**

**3.1. Geographical---** move to methods section

**3.2. Maternal Mortality Rate:** The authors of the manuscript would better confirm MMR is their variable of interest or among the study objective. If not remove this section. Please describe what your study participants looks like, sociodemographic characteristics.

**Quantitative analysis result**

Distribution of Respondent Characteristics—rewrite as sociodemographic characteristics. the authors were expected to state the number of participants used for analysis. Rewrite the result in a scientifically sound way.

**Table 1:** reframe as follows and No need of restating in paragraph what has been shown by table again

Type of biscuits	Amount	percentage
Old biscuit packing		
Baru		
Lama +baru		

**Table 2:** categorize the number of pieces of biscuits into ranges rather than putting in actual numbers.

**In general the results described in Table 1 – Table 5** has no relevance to the scientific community apart from mere reporting. The information in table 5 doesn't look like your finding. I can't understand what information the table conveys.

**The authors report that** “The results showed that out of 50 respondents, there were respondents whose MT biscuit consumption was  $\geq 80\%$  and respondents whose MT biscuit consumption was  $< 80\%$ , none of whom complied with the consumption recommendations” but fail to state the how many of the mothers consume  $>80\%$  of the supplementary food. What was the recommended consumption amount to reach on conclusion of “none of them comply”? How was compliance rate measured in your study?

The author didn't show cross tabulation showing the relationship between consumption coverage and compliance with consumption of supplementary food biscuits for pregnant women with CHD?

The outcome of the study was not well stated in the methods section and yet the author fails to clearly show the findings of his outcome variable.

**Qualitative analysis.** The authors identified 4 themes during the analysis of in-depth interview. However, the findings were not reported well. The important responses of some of the informants should have been quoted and reported. The authors didn't report the findings from in-depth interview of health workers, posyandu cadres and community leaders.

**Discussion:** The findings of quantitative study were not discussed by the authors.

Perceived severity of chronic energy deficiency (CHD) health problems was not reported in the result section. So, it doesn't worth to discuss here.

The authors are expected to revise the discussion.

**Conclusion:** state the implication of the results you identified by your study.

**Add/attach declaration of the authors at the end of the manuscript.**

**4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?**

No, the subsections and structures need revision according to the journal protocol and objective of the study.

**5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?**

The manuscript doesn't have a contradicting evidence scientifically, but the results of the manuscript were not articulated in a scientifically sound way to contribute evidence to scientific community.

**6. Are the references sufficient and recent?**

The references are sufficient, but not all are recent. Majority of the references were outdated. Additionally, few references were cited in the document body but the number of references listed are many. Unused references are listed. The reviewer has no reference to add/ suggest.

**Review Form 1.7**

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	No, the English quality of the article needs to be revised to meet scholarly write up. There many editorial, grammar error and sentence construction and punctuation errors. Unclear statements, long sentences and incomplete sentences are there in the document. Generally, the document needs major editorial revision.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	1. Use line numbering, line spacing should be 1.5' or double spacing (see journal's submission guidelines)	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Gamechu Atomsa Hunde</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Nursing, Jimma University Institute of Health, Ethiopia</b>