

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_115950
Title of the Manuscript:	GEOSPATIAL ANALYSIS OF THE HETEROGENEITY IN NUTRITIONAL STATUS AMONG WOMEN OF CHILDBEARING AGE IN NIGERIA.
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Abstract should include the results and conclusion.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No, Add some additional references</p> <p>There are some additional comments</p> <p>Section 2.3:</p> <p>Please include a reference for the BayesX software used for the additive regression models.</p> <p>Section 2.4:</p> <p>It appears the final Bayesian model was run separately for each outcome (Normal, Overweight, and Obese). Could you confirm this approach?</p> <p>Section 3.0:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Could you provide more detail on the interpretation of the posterior mean? 2. I am curious why the Underweight group was not considered for the analysis. Including this group could provide a more comprehensive understanding of weight distribution. 3. There seems to be a discrepancy in the Results section regarding the mean and 95% Credible Interval values for the Overweight category compared to Table 2. Could you address this inconsistency? 4. In Figure 1, the spatial distribution of normal weights is mentioned to have positive associations and correlations. Could you elaborate on what this means and provide a more detailed interpretation? 5. It would be beneficial to include spatial autocorrelation estimates to examine potential clustering effects within the data. This could provide insights into regional variations in weight distribution. 	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Karthikeyan Ramanujam
Department, University & Country	India