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Reviewer’s report:

Sample size should be written before in method section after study design

Baseline characteristic under result should be part of method under selection of participant

Under study design, don't mention about staff who carried out study

What is mean by healthy?

Why age restricted to <31 years

Why excluded cases of Clinical signs of VitA- or iodine deficiency, does it make any impact on nutritional status, it would have been better to include and see the change in these signs after intervention

Under discussion

Access to a free model lunch provision on workdays for five months for - in their majority not underweight female- what does it mean, I think sentence need to write properly

For subgroup analysis to arrive at conclusion, the sample is very small and among the sample subgroup analysis was done, hence drawing inference is not correct on this small sample

It would have been better if frequency of meal were ascertained as it appear that both the groups are equal and there is minimal or no change in the outcome measures

This study doesn't show any impact on nutritional status in term of biochemical parameter which is important. So one can not conclude that there is no impact of supplementation

Discussion is very lengthy make it short

Low prevalence of anemia among subject may be due to method used for estimating haemoglobin

Under conclusion

Don't repeat the sentences, write only conclusion in one para
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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