

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>
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.	In today’s world because of war a greater number of people were being displaced and forced to live in refugee camps. Their health is no-one’s responsibility. This article brings some insight to this neglected topic.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Effect of cash-based assistance on nutritional outcomes among children 0-59 months in refugee settlements of West Nile Sub-region in Uganda: A mixed method approach	

### Review Form 3

<p><b>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.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Words used in abstract for the first time like “WFP” should be with their full form subsequently we can use the short form.</li> <li>- “A descriptive design was deployed to obtain data from 122 respondents. ANOVA and Pearson’s chi-square tests, and anthropometric measurements for mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC), weight-for-age (WAZ), height-for-age (HAZ), and weight-for-height (WHZ) were taken to assess the physical growth and nutritional status of children aged 0-59 months expressed as a percentage.” <b>This paragraph is not required in Abstract part.</b></li> <li>- <b>In key words instead of children we can use “refugee children”</b> as it is one of the important key words.</li> </ul>	<p>WFP stands for World Food Programme</p> <p>This has been harmonized with the comments from other reviewers and revised as indicated in the updated manuscript.</p> <p>Children has been revised to refugee children- see revised manuscript</p>
<p><b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I am not sure about the word limits of the original articles of the journal and 9752 words were too much for an article.</li> <li>-</li> <li>- Introduction part is overcrowded with information &amp; should be more precise.</li> <li>- Also in Introduction findings of different studies( like MacPherson &amp; Sterck, (2021)) etc were not at all required and better to be included in discussion part only.</li> <li>-</li> <li>- A total of 392 respondents and 61 key informants were interviewed. However, out of 392 respondents, <b>only 122 respondents were receiving cash-based assistance</b>, and 270 of them were on food-in-kind assistance. <b>All 392 calculated sample size should be the study population instead of 122.</b></li> <li>- 61 key informants were interviewed. How 61 selected not mentioned.</li> <li>- Qualitative part is not very clear like 44 K.I interviews were done out of targeted 61 but no mention about how many FGDs were being done.Also in observation what exactly observed and whether it was <b>participatory or non- participatory</b> not very clear.</li> </ul> <p>In result part:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Background information of the study population like (age distribution 0-6 months,6-12months,12-24 etc,gender M/F and received cash assistance amount) in tabular form would have been better and should be in the first paragraph of the result section.</li> <li>- The study findings showed that out of the 392 respondents, 31.12% of caregivers of children 0-59 months received cash assistance with 81.58% of caregivers in Adjumani district and 26.13% of caregivers in Obongi refugee settlements <b>at a P-value of 0.000</b> receiving cash as compared to 68.88% of caregivers on food assistance modality. <b>What is the importance of P-value here and what does it signifies?</b></li> </ul>	<p>This has been revised. See the revised manuscript.</p> <p>This has been revised. See the revised manuscript.</p> <p>This has been revised. See the revised manuscript.</p> <p>Out of 61 targeted key informants, 44 were interviewed. A total of 16 out of 20 focus group discussions (FGDs) were conducted. Non-participatory Observation was done which focused on; the general nutrition status of children, feeding practices, food preparation, and storage practices of caregivers, and the food and cash distribution process including non-food item distribution.</p> <p>The table has been included. See the revised manuscript.</p> <p>This has been revised as “The study findings showed that out of the 392 respondents, 31.12% of caregivers of children 0-59 months received cash assistance with significant proportions between the districts of81.58% of caregivers in Adjumani district and 26.13% of caregivers in Obongi refugee settlements at a P-value &lt;0.05 receiving cash as compared to 68.88% of caregivers on food in-kind assistance modality”.</p>
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- sufficient</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>-Good</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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>	