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Reviewer's report:

This is a well written manuscript about a specific element of clinical management of SAM around which uncertainty exists.

I think the most important change that is needed is for the authors to make a more definitive statement about transition. Do the authors consider transition to be a 'success' using this strategy? On one hand a 'success' rate of 65% is presented, on the other the second attempt to transition using the same process was almost always successful. What is the risk of trying twice, and if there is not much risk, why is this 'test of transition' labeled a failure? One might imagine a treatment unit where the transition test is administered daily and what is reported is the duration of treatment at the time of transition. This decision will help shape the arguments of the manuscript.

The factors associated with failure of transition are by enlarge not dynamic clinical assessments, but rather demographic or chronic illness characteristics of the child. This is a key point.

In the abstract section- conclusion, the first 2 sentences are too general, I would omit them.

line 26 abstract omit phrase 'negative reactions, such as'

The blood testing procedures are described in another paper and do not need to be repeated here.

The word 'smooth' on page 10 line 11 and line 27 should be replaced with something more concrete.

Limited evidence is referred to on page 4 line 15. Isn't this expert opinion? It can be stated as such.

Page 15 line 28-29, this manuscript is not about causing anything, so I would omit this sentence.

What about programs that do not use a transition phase, is there any information about these for comparison?

Some lines are bolded in Table 2 that are not significant.

On Figure 1 please show the '51 children' who are described in Tables 3 and 4.
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