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Really, thanks for your invitation to review this manuscript.

Overview: the authors of this manuscript raised an important research area which a significant advantage for the reductions of maternal mortality and morbidity, and also for child health. However needs an intensive works before considering the manuscript for publication.

Abstract: needs revision based on the BMC nutrition abstract preparation guideline. Line: 20-13, remove this statement, which is not necessary for the objective. Line: 25-28: method section of the abstract: Include also the searching mechanism and utilized website. Line: 30-59: result sections of the abstract, please report what has been done using figure and. How many studies were searched....? In general the abstract sections lack information what activities has been accomplished.

Page 3: line5-8: limit the keyword to not more than 10.

Introduction: This section is written well. However, it is to shallow, please detail the problem more than what has been said. I did not catch up what interventions have been targeted before? What result was achieved? What initiates you to conduct this? The existing problem might not be the only reason to conduct a research.

Methods: Page 5, line 30 inclusion criteria: why you considered only those articles published in English language? This has a selection bias, which might not represent the study setting even. The method section has no information about quality assessment process of the reviewed articles. What about the analysis? What kind of analysis software was used? Where is the heterogeneity test? The method section needs to be written in detail.
Results: in this section, the researchers reported about the articles reviewed and the status. However, it looks like discussion. Because the authors discussed finding from the literature like UNICEF, 2009

Discussion: Page 12, line 15-35, as a discussion, this section of the research did not give any meaning to the finding. The author looks have no information on what discussion mean and how? What? Content of the study must be incorporated when a discussion section is written. All the written information under the sub-title of discussion is conclusion and recommendations. So please focus on your main finding based on the objectives you stand for answering and then discuss them here by comparing with guideline, previous studies, and planned targets. I am not totally comfortable with what currently written discussion. I am unable to catch what finding and message should the studies come up. The other one the discussion section is to shallow. Please write or discuss the finding you found detail and more.

Recommendations for further studies

On the same page 12, line 40 to page 13, line 23: The recommendation given for the study is not focused and appropriate. Why the authors of the manuscript putted the recommendations of other work? Why you cited the source? Recommendation needs to be stated based on the main finding/result of the study based on the objectives. But here the author stated others work. This is completely wrong and needs to be written again focusing the main result. Finally, put the recommendation next to conclusion.

Declaration section:

Page 14 on line 5-16, Please remove the abbreviations from the declaration section. Abbreviations are not part of the declaration. Follow the guideline of the BMC manuscript preparation format.

Figure 1. PRISMA Flow Diagram of articles through the scoping review process updated May 22, 2018
doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097

On the first line of identification the authors mention 494 articles that are unduplicated. And 16 accessed from other source. In total 510 articles were searched. In the presence of this fact above, the authors left article only 308 after removing the duplication one. Previously, the authors told us they have 494 articles which are unduplicated and here they removed more and left with 308. Why? What does it mean? This is a confusing figure.
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