



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_49032
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutritional quality of food supplements for children from 6 to 59 months proposed to the dietary service of CHR of Daloa (Côte d'Ivoire)
Type of the 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>Title of the Manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- The title should not be in short form, ie: CHR 2- If possible, I would suggest if the author(s) can replace the word (Côte d'Ivoire) to Ivory Coast as it is known worldwide. <p>Abstract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- An abstract is a short summary of your completed research. It should express your article and your key points. 2- The basic components of an abstract; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Motivation/problem statement b) Methods/procedure/approach c) Results/findings/product d) Conclusion/implications 3- The abstract should begin with a brief but precise statement of the problem or issue, followed by a description of the research method and design, the major findings, and the conclusions reached. 4- It is important to catch the reader's attention by making the abstract as concise, accurate and readable as possible. 5- In this paper, the abstract is not well written due to some reasons: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The problem statement is unclear b) Method: Normally, people do not put formulation in an abstract (line no 12, 13, 14) c) Results/findings: What are the main/major findings and what did you learn/invent/create? d) Conclusion reached? <p>Intext-citation and References:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Most of the sources listed in the references are considered outdated. The most recent is in 2013. Please add more recent sources to support the findings and discussions. 2- Sources or literature review should include recent studies (5 recent years). Be up to date but do not forget the older studies 	
Minor REVISION comments		
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>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sazelin Arif
Department, University & Country	Universiti Teknikal Malaysia Melaka , Malaysia