

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JOCAMR_101989</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Overview of Knowledge about the Importance of the First 1000 Days of Life in Women of Reproductive Age (15 - 49 Years) in 2021</b>
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:

(<https://www.journaljocamr.com/index.php/JOCAMR/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <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>1) the manuscript brings nothing significant or innovative. The structure and content of the text are comparable to a diploma thesis. The authors declared that it is a descriptive study concerning the degree of knowledge of the importance of nutrition in the first 1000 days of life in a sample of women of childbearing age.</p> <p>2) The title must make it clear that we are talking about Indonesian women.</p> <p>3) the abstract reports the essential data but contains many superfluous repetitions (for example it is repeated several times that the women are of childbearing age). Why was the acronym HPK used to indicate First thousand days of life? what does it mean?</p> <p>4) as mentioned in point 1, the structure of the text is approximative and not suitable and in line with scientific standards. The lack of page and line numbering makes it difficult to pinpoint any problems. It is not clear whether the text is a review or research. Also, in the text there are many repetitions of concepts. Often the logical sequence of the topics presented is not seen, with sentences placed apparently at random (in ex. page 3 Scalig Up Nutrition ...) which would be better moved after the reference [20]. Even the definition of BMI at peg 4 seems taken out of context. The results do not report the BMI of the participants. On page 4 "Every days...etc...[31]" are unrelated sentences. Which "Lancet Series" are you referring to on page 2? please specify.</p> <p>Research Method. the authors say they administered a questionnaire that should be inserted in the text. Has the questionnaire been validated? What does "...a certain method is used..." mean? which method? What does "...follow certain criteria..." mean? what criteria? What are the inclusion and exclusion criteria the authors are talking about? "Data analysis is...in table or graphs" what is the need to explain the importance of data analysis? it is obvious and applied to all scientific research. In the formula what do ppp and I? Q does not appear in the formula. X, what does correct answers mean? Did the questions in the questionnaire have right or wrong answers? if yes, it seems very strange for a poll.</p> <p>Result ad Discussion. Many redundant repetitions. where are the graphs referred to by the authors? The authors stratified the population according to age, education and occupation. Why weren't knowledge levels stratified in a similar way? Who or What is <i>Notoatmodjo</i>?</p> <p>Conclusion. Many redundant repetitions What is ASI? please specify acronym.</p> <p>5) in manuscript is not scientifically correct 6) the references appear adequate</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>I am not qualified to judge the language</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

<b>Optional/General</b> comments	the manuscript has numerous and serious shortcomings both in the structure and in the logical sequence, furthermore in the collection and presentation of the data, therefore it should be completely rewritten. In this form it is suitable for a diploma thesis, not for a scientific journal.	
----------------------------------	--	--

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Corsetti Giovanni</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Brescia, Italy</b>