

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRNH_96608
Title of the Manuscript:	CROSS SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF NUTRITIONAL STATUS AND MAJOR CHRONIC CONDITIONS IN OLDER ADULTS
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.journalajrn.com/index.php/AJRNH/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The authors prepared this on an interesting issue, which is an important public health problem for older adults. My comments on the article includes the followings:</p> <p><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> The chi square value of this indicates that there is no association between BMI and hypertension, BMI and diet adequacy, however, the author(s) interpreted "a non-linear relationship with BMI and the major chronic disorders .....". Therefore, the message for the scientific community is no statistical significant relationship between independent and outcome variables. This may be add some new finding to compare with other articles for scientific community, even the author(s) failed indicate it clearly use linear model.</p> <p><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> More attractive if written as ANALYSIS OF NUTRITIONAL STATUS AND MAJOR CHRONIC CONDITIONS IN OLDER ADULTS:- A CROSS SECTIONAL STUDY</p> <p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> Yes</p> <p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> Partially</p> <p><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> The author(s) failed to interpret and narrate it be scientifically sounded. It should be revised.</p> <p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent?</b> Yes</p> <p><b>It will be more clear if the author(s) edit the followings:</b> Add sub topic <b>operational definition</b> and put "The WHO classification of BMI, diabetes mellitus and hypertension and Abnormal lipid". Add sub topic <b>statistical analysis/ data analysis</b> and put "Data was cleaned, coded and subsequently entered into Microsoft Excel 2010 sheet. The data was analyzed and inferential statistics using chi square (<math>\chi^2</math>) was employed to determine the degree of association between the various conditions and statistical significance was set at a p value". Better if limitation put after discussion.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>The English quality or grammar is good, but the problem for this article is interpretation of the result and discussion in scientific knowledge.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Elias Ezo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Wachemo University, Ethiopia</b>