

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_120440
Title of the Manuscript:	The Performance of the Mid-Day Meal Scheme on the Nutritional and Educational Status of Rural School Children in Bihar
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript on the Mid-Day Meal Scheme in Bihar holds significant importance for the scientific community due to its comprehensive evaluation of a crucial government initiative aimed at improving both nutritional and educational outcomes among rural schoolchildren. The study's findings provide valuable insights into the scheme's effectiveness, highlighting improvements in height, weight, enrollment rates, and attendance while also identifying areas needing further attention, such as academic performance and attention span. Such nuanced analysis contributes substantially to understanding the real-world impacts of large-scale nutritional interventions in educational settings.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of your article seems quite appropriate for describing the focus and scope of your study.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article covers the main points effectively. However, here are a few suggestions for improvement: Mention sample size and sampling strategy. Work on the grammatical and syntax errors. Write the one-liner implications of the study.</p> <p>For more comments, see the main file. I have provided comments there.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The structure of the article can be improved more. For example: The introduction can be more organized by providing clearly defined paragraphs, each focusing on a single idea or aspect of the scheme. Subheadings for the methodology section such as research design, sampling strategy, sample, inclusion and exclusion criteria, scale of measurement, procedure, statistical analysis, and ethical considerations. In the conclusion section, add the subheadings of Implications, limitations and suggestions of the study.</p>	
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound for several reasons. Firstly, it employs a quantitative methodology with a representative sample of rural schools, ensuring a comprehensive assessment of both nutritional and educational indicators. Secondly, it systematically evaluates various metrics such as attendance, dropout rates, height, weight, and academic achievement, providing a holistic view of the scheme's impact. Thirdly, the study compares responses from different stakeholders—parents and teachers—adding depth to the analysis and ensuring robustness in interpreting the results across multiple perspectives. Overall, these factors contribute to the manuscript's scientific credibility and thoroughness in examining the Mid-Day Meal Scheme's effectiveness in Bihar's rural context.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p>	<p>There need a few references in some paragraphs which I have commented in the main file. Few references you have cited are outdated. Try to use recent references.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	While the content is comprehensive, the language could benefit from some refinement to improve clarity and academic tone. For instance, some sentences are lengthy and could be broken down for better readability. There are also some grammatical and spelling errors.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zoya Sajid
Department, University & Country	University of the Punjab, Pakistan