

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_130249
Title of the Manuscript:	Cash-based assistance and nutritional outcomes among refugee children 0-59 months in West Nile Sub-region in Uganda.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: 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>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript is of significant importance to the scientific community, particularly in the field of humanitarian aid and nutrition, as it provides valuable insights into the effectiveness of cash-based assistance in improving the nutritional outcomes of refugee children. By examining the nutritional status of children in refugee settlements in Uganda, it contributes to understanding how different assistance modalities, such as cash transfers, impact child health in resource-constrained environments. Furthermore, the study highlights the importance of factors such as caregiver education, food storage, and feeding practices, offering a comprehensive look at the multi-dimensional nature of child nutrition in humanitarian contexts. The findings of this research could guide future policy and interventions by humanitarian organizations to enhance the effectiveness of their aid programs, ensuring that refugee children receive the necessary support for better nutritional outcomes.	This has been corrected in the revised manuscript
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title of the article is generally suitable. However, to make it slightly more concise and engaging, you could consider the following alternative:  <b>"Impact of Cash-based Assistance on Nutritional Outcomes in Refugee Children (0-59 Months) in Uganda’s West Nile Sub-region."</b>	The comment on the title has been adopted as “The impact of Cash-based Assistance on the Nutritional Outcomes in Refugee Children (0-59 Months) in West Nile Sub-region of Uganda."

Review Form 3

<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is generally comprehensive, but there are a few areas that could benefit from clarification or further detail to improve its overall clarity and flow.</p> <p>The abstract could more explicitly highlight the primary objective of the study early on. Although it mentions assessing the impact of cash-based assistance, the role of other factors (like caregivers' education, food storage, etc.) is introduced later in the paragraph, which might distract from the main aim. Consider restructuring to make the central objective clearer.</p> <p><b>We suggest theses: “This study examined the effect of cash-based assistance on the nutritional outcomes of children aged 0-59 months in refugee settlements in the West Nile Sub-region of Uganda, while also assessing the influence of various factors such as caregiver education, food storage, and child-feeding practices.”</b></p> <p><b>“Data was collected from 122 respondents using a descriptive study design. Statistical analyses, including ANOVA and Pearson’s chi-square tests, were employed to assess the relationship between cash assistance and nutritional outcomes, with anthropometric measurements (MUAC, WAZ, HAZ, WHZ) used to evaluate physical growth.”</b></p> <p><b>“These findings suggest that while cash-based assistance does not show a statistically significant impact on nutritional outcomes, it may still play a role in improving food security. Humanitarian agencies should consider scaling up cash-based transfers alongside broader food security and livelihood interventions to enhance household food access.”</b></p>	<p>Comments addressed and updated in the revised manuscript</p>
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript presents scientifically valid concepts and follows appropriate research methods</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references provided are a solid starting point, covering a range of topics related to nutrition, food security, and humanitarian food assistance.</p>	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript is well-written for a scholarly audience, but the clarity, consistency, and flow could be improved with minor revisions.	The manuscript has been revised accordingly.
Optional/General comments	<p><b>Overall, the introduction sets the stage for a deeper exploration of cash transfer programs and their impact, with a clear focus on both the benefits and the challenges. Nonetheless, additional emphasis on the specific nutritional outcomes in refugee populations would strengthen the content further.</b></p> <p><b>The terms "refugee hosting districts" and "refugee settlements" are used, but they are not always clearly differentiated. Clarifying the difference between these terms (hosting district vs. settlement) could enhance clarity.</b></p> <p><b>The mention of "STAT 18.0" is unclear. It is likely a typo or misstatement, as the correct statistical software should be "SPSS" or similar. Additionally, the explanation of statistical techniques could be expanded to explain what specific analyses were carried out (e.g., t-tests, chi-squared tests, etc.).</b></p> <p><b>Some sentences are long and complex, making them harder to read. For example: "As, of April 2020, Adjumani district had 223,785 refugees (29,710 HHs) and 125,617 refugees (28,810 HHs) were in Obongi district..." could be revised for better flow: "As of April 2020, Adjumani district hosted 223,785 refugees (29,710 households), while Obongi district had 125,617 refugees (28,810 households)."</b></p> <p><b>The P-values are appropriately provided, but some expressions should be adjusted for greater precision. For example, "P-value of 0.000" is correct, but it could be perceived as oversimplified. A more precise description like "P-value &lt; 0.01" would avoid misinterpretation.</b></p> <p><b>"The cash assistance modality was adopted by humanitarian agencies to shift away from food in-kind assistance since it is the cost of distributing cash is lower than food": This sentence is awkwardly phrased. A clearer revision would be: "The cash assistance modality was adopted by humanitarian agencies to replace in-kind food assistance, as the cost of distributing cash is lower than distributing food."</b></p> <p><b>"At a P-value of 0.000 receiving cash": It is incorrect to use "P-value of 0.000," as a P-value of zero is extremely rare. It would be more accurate to say "P-value &lt; 0.001."</b></p> <p><b>"cash assistance of between 19,000 to 24,000 per person": The correct phrasing would be: "cash assistance between 19,000 and 24,000 Uganda shillings per person" for clarity and to follow proper language rules.</b></p> <p><b>"The majority of children were normal (Not malnourished), with MUAC of more than 12.5cm": A more accurate phrasing would be: "The majority of children were of normal nutritional status, with MUAC greater than 12.5 cm."</b></p>	<p>Additional information has been included. See the revised manuscript</p> <p>Refugee hosting districts refer to administrative units in this case districts in which refugees are settled while refugee settlements refer to areas within the district where refugees are settled.</p> <p>STATA was used for the analysis instead of SPSS since it gives the same results as SPSS. However, we had a licensed version for STATA 18.</p> <p>This has been revised as below and included in the revised manuscript</p> <p>This has been corrected in the revised manuscript as attached.</p> <p>This has been revised and updated in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>This has been revised and updated in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>This has been revised and updated in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>This has been revised and updated in the revised manuscript.</p>

Review Form 3

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>	