

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_98146
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF HOME-MADE FORMULA ON GROWTH PERFORMANCE OF MALNOURISHED PRE-SCHOOL CHILDREN (24-36 MONTHS OF AGE) IN YOBE STATE NIGERIA
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.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, article is very important, give access for care, in case of low-income communities.</p> <p>2. Yes, great</p> <p>3. Yes, come corrections are suggested for the sentence: "They were fed at 16.88 ml/kg body weight 8hours (?) daily throughout a 6th week study"</p> <p>4. Yes, but if I could suggest to invert the order of presentation of data in tables, re-do the analysis by before and after intervention.</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. ok</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Please correct some words, for example some "milk" are written like "milk"...</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Please check the writing, there are some spelling problems.</p> <p>The tables 2, 3 and 4, maybe would be better do the analysis by before and after intervention, don't compare the difference between regions. You can place the baseline data and after intervention in columns.</p> <p>Would be interesting to add the data about the total intake (energy and macronutrients), if it is possible.</p>	

Comment [U1]: Enteral? Continuous?

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lenyca de Cassya Lopes Neri
Department, University & Country	University of Pavia, Italy