

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_105030
Title of the Manuscript:	Minimum dietary diversity and anthropometric measures of nutritional status among children aged 6–23 months in rural Noakhali, Bangladesh.
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://journalajfrn.com/index.php/AJFRN/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>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.-I consider that the article, due to its characteristics, is important for the scientific communit.</p> <p>2.- The Title gives a clear idea of the type of study and its scope</p> <p>3.- The summary is complete and in a quick reading it gives a clear idea of the study</p> <p>4.- The subsections and structure is logical and consistent</p> <p>5.- The article is scientifically correct, since it meets the methodological requirements for studies of its type.</p> <p>6.- The references are updated, I do not consider adding new ones</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The analysis is pertinent for the community where it was carried out, there is a lot of literature on nutritional problems and intervention studies, in my opinion this would be the next step, studies that show a nutritional intervention in favor of these patients. Their results are similar to others previously reported.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Guillermo Yanowsky Reyes
Department, University & Country	Universidad de Guadalajara, México