

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>European Journal of Nutrition &amp; Food Safety</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_EJNFS_113016</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A Review on Incidence of Protein Energy Malnutrition and Its Associated Risk Factors Among Pre – School Children.</b>
Type of the Article	

**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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. According to the title and the topic of the research, this manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses a critical public health issue among preschool children. By analyzing and identifying the incidence and risk factors of PEM, this research contributes valuable insight for developing targeted interventions.</li> <li>2. The title of this manuscript is suitable as it reflects the focus and scope of the study. In addition, the title directly related to the study's objective.</li> <li>3. The abstract is not directly visible in the provided content. An Abstract should succinctly summarize the background, objectives, methods, results and conclusions. For comprehensive evaluation, the abstract should include details such as the study design, population/samples, significant results and implications for practice. There is no specific details about the methods used for data collection, the sample or the location of the study. The abstract mentions rural regions and inequalities but does not provide a clear background information about the study area.</li> <li>4. The structure of the manuscript as implied by the discussion of its content, seems appropriate for the topic. However, no research methodology was found in the manuscript.</li> <li>5. The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct within the context of its objectives. The conclusions drawn are consistent with the finding, the study adheres to scientific principles and contributes valid insights to the field of nutritional epidemiology. However, the accuracy would require a deeper analysis of the data sources, analytical methods and interpretation of results.</li> <li>6. For research using secondary data, the literature review and the references should be more detailed, up to date, and more in number.</li> <li>7. The use terms like "underweight" and "severely underweight" without clear definitions or reference to established criteria for malnutrition assessment.</li> <li>8. It does not clearly state the research hypotheses guiding or research questions.</li> <li>9. The manuscript mention research studies conducted in 20 articles paper but does not provide proper citations or references</li> <li>10. While mentions percentages of malnourished children, it does not provide information about statistical significance, leaving the reader uncertain about the reliability of the findings.</li> <li>11. The discussion section could be improve by offering detail the implications of the findings, comparing them more extensively with existing literature and discussing potential limitation of the study.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>The language/English quality of the article needs to be improved. It is recommended to use proof reading service</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The title of this research is important and interesting to discuss, but its quality could be enhanced by providing more detailed explanations regarding the research methods, sampling locations and other aspects highlighted in the review's feedback. The reliance on secondary data reduces the capacity to directly examine the quality and establish causality.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ruri Aditya Sari</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia</b>