

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_108712
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutritional Status of Adolescents in Public and Private Secondary Schools in Asaba, Delta State
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>The manuscript has scientific importance to scholars because it shed light on the vulnerability of adolescents to nutrition shocks due to behavioural and physiological needs putting them in need of attention.</p> <p>The title of the manuscript is appropriate because it captures the key words to attract the attention of the reader</p> <p>The abstract is very comprehensive covering all the important parts from introduction, methodology, results and conclusion</p> <p>All subsections of the abstract are appropriate addressing key areas with introduction laying the background to study, methods employed, research finding presentation, and conclusion.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct. It presents researching findings of a study that addressed a gap in nutrition needs of a population subgroup.</p> <p>Reference are adequate. Most are recent meaning they have latest scientific evidence. Only a few are more than 10 years old. For example reference dating 2010 to 2012 may be a bit older.</p> <p>The study is comprehensive and well presented.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language used in this study is very clear and presented in an easy to understand manner</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically sound and addresses a public health need</p> <p>minor revision on reference. To include current references where the manuscript has old references</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:	Catherine Wangu Shitemi
Department, University & Country	Kenya