

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_104998
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge Disease Infection and Sanitation Environment in Mother Against Stunting Control in Makassar City
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.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The research is a cross-sectional epidemiological study, with results of great relevance for scientific knowledge and technical applications. 2. Yes. 3. Yes. 4. No, because the Methods topic is described in a very superficial way, making it difficult for the reader to understand. In this case, I recommend that the Method be rewritten in detail, following a logical and chronological sequence of the procedures and methods that were followed to achieve the results obtained. 5. Yes. 6. Yes, because most have been published for less than 10 years. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	I think so	
<p>Optional/General 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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Narcísio Cabral de Araújo
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Southern Bahia, Brazil