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Reviewer’s report:

The paper "acceptability and utilization of a lipid-based nutrient supplement formulated for pregnant women in rural Niger: a multi-methods study" aimed to assess the acceptability and utilization of a 40gLNl formulation (Epi-E) with increased micronutrient content relative to the recommended daily allowance among pregnant women in rural Niger.

It is an interesting paper. however, there are some limitations not discussed by the authors.

First of all, Table 1 presents the nutrient composition of Epi-E. For some nutrients, the dose is higher than the RDA. For which reason? since it is well described in the literature that there is no advantage of nutrient daily doses higher that the RDA.

More than that, the authors did not mention if the doses are higher that the UL. This would be a problem.

So, I suggest that in methods and discussion this topic should be deeply discussed.

Another limitation of the study is that the authors did not evaluate the impact on the adequacy of nutrient intake in those women. There were no data on food intake? If not, please discuss this topic.

in the conclusion, the authors should describe that future studies are necessary to test the effect on the adequacy of nutrient intake, and on maternal and infant outcomes

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript
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