

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_100535
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutritional assessment of farm women under Nutri-Smart village Programme
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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 REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes,the manuscript can contribute well for scientific community.It can increase the knowledge level of the individuals interested in nutrition field.</p> <p>Yes,the title of article is suitable.</p> <p>The abstract need some comprehensive words to enhance the overall understanding of manuscript.</p> <p>Yes, the subsections and structure of manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>Yes,the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references are not updated and sufficient.The writer must include the recent references and also increase the numbers of references.</p> <p>The standards which were used for declaration of good,average and poor are not mentioned. The name of statistic methods and statistic software are not mentioned. Pie-chart and flow charts must be design in manuscript The questionnaires are not properly numbered.</p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes	
<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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Muhammad Hasnain</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Peshawar, Pakistan</b>