

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_83449
Title of the Manuscript:	Fish-oil supplements for schoolchildren: a pilot intervention setup in a Maltese school for policy formulation in school communities
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/editorial-policy> )

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments  
English

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>English of the manuscript needs to be improved drastically</li><li>Please get it reviewed by a professional or use the software or take the help of such service</li><li>More health parameters in children may be assessed</li><li>Questionnaire may be prepared more elaborate</li><li>Statistical analysis of feedback is desired</li><li>Future plan to be included</li><li>Conclusion is not clear since benefits of fish oil are reported earlier, parents feedback to continue this initiative is I feel just one of the outcomes , but please try to make the study meaningful although I understand, it is not a clinical trial</li><li>Unless more benefits are shown in children, Govt is unlikely to support the initiative</li><li>In future studies, vegan alternatives to fish oil may be used.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>English of the manuscript needs to be improved drastically</li><li>Please get it reviewed by a professional or use the software or take the help of such service</li></ul> <p>Please see corrections in the revised manuscript highlighted in yellow. Moreover, our article was checked by Dr Maria Carolina Rojido, a medical writing and scientific communications consultant. The recommendations that she had given us were as much as possible taken into consideration and implemented. You are free to check with her by contacting her on: <a href="mailto:carolinarojido@gmail.com">carolinarojido@gmail.com</a> If the reviewer is still not satisfied with our output he/she should be specific and tell us which particular sentences need to be reworded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>More health parameters in children may be assessed</li></ul> <p>We were not after any health benefits and we had no intention of challenging the health parameters that are already amply explained in the literature. Our aim was to raise awareness on the benefits of fish oil in children. We believe that our goal <u>to show that fish oil supplements can be administered at school</u> was achieved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Questionnaire may be prepared more elaborate</li></ul> <p>The questionnaire is what it is. We cannot go back in time and start the intervention again! Please judge us on what we did and not on what we did not do. Even a 100,000-word PhD thesis is never exhaustive!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Statistical analysis of feedback is desired</li></ul> <p>This is just a pilot study. It's written down even in the main title. It is like saying it is a preliminary study. So, you can't expect to find everything in in! As a beginning, we only used simple descriptive statistics. There is no inferential process to perform complex statistical analysis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Future plan to be included</li></ul> <p>In the Conclusion we gave a number of recommendations, namely that the government would need to carry out cost-benefit analysis; to avoid year 3 students (7-8-year-olds); to include boys; to use a higher dose of omega-3 and so on.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Conclusion is not clear since benefits of fish oil are reported earlier, parents feedback to continue this initiative is I feel just one of the outcomes , but please try to make the study meaningful although I understand, it is not a clinical trial</li></ul> <p>The reviewer him/herself said it: <u>this is not a clinical trial</u>. I cannot understand how more meaningful we can do it! The other two reviewers had no problems accepting our paper as it is.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Unless more benefits are shown in children, Govt is unlikely to support the initiative</li></ul> <p>The benefits are all explained in the literature review. It is not our problem if the government does not recognize these benefits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>In future studies, vegan alternatives to fish oil may be used.</li></ul> <p>Thank you for this suggestion. In the Conclusion I have added this text: For children who follow vegan diets, or are allergic to fish, or for whom the fishy aftertaste bothers them, they should be offered alternatives to fish oil. These are usually derived from algae but it is important that they are fortified with vitamin D.</p>

Review Form 1.6

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Please use language editing service	Please see corrections in the revised manuscript highlighted in yellow. Moreover, our article was checked by Dr Maria Carolina Rojido, a medical writing and scientific communications consultant. The recommendations that she had given us were as much as possible taken into consideration and implemented. You are free to check with her by contacting her on: <a href="mailto:carolinarojido@gmail.com">carolinarojido@gmail.com</a> If the reviewer is still not satisfied with our output he/she should be specific and tell us which particular sentences need to be reworded.
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Good work , more data is to be included to support the initiative	The article is what it is. We cannot go back in time and start the intervention all over again! After all, this is a pilot/preliminary study. Other researchers are free to replicate our study and add on to what we have already achieved... Please judge us on what we did, and not on what we did not do! Even a 100,000-word PhD thesis is never exhaustive! Please remember that.

PART 2:

	<b><u>Reviewer's comment</u></b>	<b><u>Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</u></b>
<b><u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u></b>	<b><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></b>	There are no ethical issues. We obtained parents' consent. This is not a clinical trial.