



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_48436
Title of the Manuscript:	PREVALENCE AND DETERMINANTS OF MALNUTRITION IN UNDER FIVE CHILDREN IN EGUME, KOGI STATE, NIGERIA
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Please check and correct English language and spelling errors (through whole document).</p> <p>Study design: It can only be cross-sectional study with historic data.</p> <p>Sentence: "The results revealed that the age range between 21-30 (64%) participated more in the study." Collision with the Table 1. Correct either this sentence or data in the Table 1.</p> <p>Sentence: "30% are Igalas." Collision with the Table 1. Correct either this sentence or data in the Table 1.</p> <p>Sentence: "A good percentage (84%) of the mothers breastfeed their children for the duration of 19-24 months." Collision with the Table 4. Correct either this sentence or data in the Table 4.</p> <p>Sentence: "...shows that 10.6% of the male children were mildly underweight, 14.2% where moderately underweight, 24.8% where severely underweight, and 9% were healthy. Collision with the Figure 1. Correct either this sentence or data in the Figure 1.</p> <p>Figure 1. The total sum gives 91.8%. Where is the rest of 8.2%?</p> <p>In the Discussion section it starts with the prevalence and nowhere in the paper before you didn't show or compute prevalence rate of malnutrition.</p> <p>Referencing is wrongly done.</p>	<p>Corrections in English language and errors done.</p> <p>Study design has been corrected appropriately</p> <p>All corrections referring to Tables 1 and 4 have been addressed appropriately. As shown in the text.</p> <p>Figure 1 and discussions related to it have been addressed appropriately. As shown in the text.</p> <p>Calculations relating to Fig 1 have been appropriately done.</p> <p>Discussion section has been adjusted properly</p> <p>Referencing has been adjusted appropriately according to the given guidelines.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>When did you perform this study (what year and months)?</p> <p>Age group <20 in Table 1. need to put zeroes.</p> <p>Breastfeed data No in Table 4. need to put zeroes.</p> <p>Figure 1. replace decimal comma with decimal full stop.</p>	<p>Duration of study is shown in section 2.1 (Study design and duration).</p> <p>Zeroes have been added as required in tables 1 and 4.</p>
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	