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Reviewer's report:

→ General comments:

- The research work is quite commendable, but the write-up is somewhat cumbersome, with several aspects that were difficult to understand.

- Some of the sentences were not well structured grammatically and there were also typographical errors.

- Some of the abbreviations used in the text were not defined; they should preferably be defined at the first point of use. e.g. Line 85- aGvHD, Line 117- CVC.

Though a list of abbreviations was provided somewhere, it is still important to define each abbreviation within the text.

→ Title: 'in' was omitted before 'children' in the Title.

→ Introduction:

- The aim of the study (Lines 89-90) is biased. It ends with "in order to give further evidence supporting its use". This should be revised.

→ Methods:

- The Methods section was not detailed, leaving much expected information to be imagined.

- Some of the sub-topics in that section were not appropriate. e.g. Nutritional support during neutropenic period; Study design, Transplantation and Nutritional outcomes. Are the outcomes not part of the results?

- Were there any exclusion criteria?

- Line 117 - What type of hospital-made compound? What was the composition?
What type of commercial formula?

The authors wrote: 'children receiving EN for more than 7 days were included in the EN group, while children who received EN for less than 7 days or received only PN were in the PN group'.

Will this classification not be a confounding factor? Why not limit the PN group to those who received only PN? Those who received EN for 6 days and those who received it for 7 or 8 days cannot be considered to be different in that respect.

Lines 151-152: The online calculator, CDC charts and WHO charts that were used should be referenced.

Results:

In several places, p values that were greater than 0.05 were interpreted as though the findings were significant, meanwhile authors had previously specified (under Methods) that only p values < 0.05 will be considered as statistically significant. e.g. Lines 171-173.

The use of the comma symbol (,) in place of decimal points (.) is quite confusing and may not be appropriate.

Discussion: The discussion is not 'rich' enough. The section needs to be expanded and enriched.

Conclusion: The conclusion is not focused. It should be revised.
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