

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	Research 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>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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>No. Should be revised with proper format, headings and subheadings.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Should be updated with latest studies by 2024.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Needs corrections and improvement.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. Some statements in the concerned manuscript are not clear and can be self-contradictory (e.g., The link between employment and weight also yielded surprising results. Nigerian working women were more likely to be overweight or obese compared to non-working women. This contrasts with studies in Bangladesh where non-employed women were more likely to be underweight [24].). I would suggest the authors to look into these and correct them with appropriate references.</p> <p>2. The authors claimed that "This approach addresses limitations of previous studies that relied on simpler methods [15]" but the results as observed in their study only establishes the results/facts as observed in those previous studies which have incorporated simpler and easier to understand statistical tools/ methods. Therefore, the statistical method used in this study does not satisfactorily establish its importance as a statistical method to be used in public health research. More elucidation is necessary in terms of the used statistical method.</p> <p>3. Whole manuscript needs proper and even formatting (e.g., line spacings, etc.)</p>	

PART 2:

	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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u></p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sampriti Debnath
Department, University & Country	Dr. Girilal Gupta Institute of Public Health & Public Affairs, University of Lucknow, India