

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_127817
Title of the Manuscript:	Determine the socio-economic and demographic characteristics of caregivers of children aged 6-59 months in Kericho County, Kenya.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/> Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript addresses a critical issue in public health by investigating the determinants of nutritional status in children aged 6 to 59 months in Kericho County, Kenya. It highlights the role of socio-economic and demographic characteristics, providing valuable insights for targeted interventions. The findings have significant implications for policy development and healthcare strategies to combat malnutrition.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is appropriate and well-structured.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive and well-structured. Consider adding a brief mention of policy implications to strengthen the conclusion. Comment: The last two sentences of the abstract are clear but could be revised for conciseness. Combining them into one sentence will enhance readability and avoid repetition. Suggestion: Consider rephrasing as: "This study underscores the critical role of caregiver education in shaping child nutritional outcomes and highlights the need for targeted interventions to improve caregiver knowledge and practices."	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically robust. However, the following minor improvements are suggested: 1. Ensure consistent formatting for reference numbers in parentheses (e.g., "(4, 7, 8, 9)" to "(4,7-9)"). (Page 2) 2. Briefly justify the use of systematic random sampling and explain how biases were mitigated in the Methodology Section (Page 6). 3. Standardize rounding in Table 2 (Page 8) to present percentages consistently (e.g., either use whole numbers or one decimal place).	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and relevant. Ensure formatting consistency, particularly with journal names and author ordering. Comment: Some references include a long list of authors without standard truncation after the sixth author, which creates inconsistency.	

Review Form 3

	Suggestion: For example, in <i>Gudu, E., Obonyo, M., Omballa, V., Oyugi, E., Kiilu, C., Githuku, J., ... & Ransom, J. (2020)</i> , consider standardizing truncation for authors after six names by using "et al." as per standard referencing guidelines.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript's language is clear and scholarly. Minor grammatical adjustments for smoother readability are recommended (e.g., rephrase "Children whose moms were served before their parents had a 1.30 times higher risk of wasting" to "Children whose mothers were served first had a 1.30 times higher risk of wasting").	
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:	Abid Ali
Department, University & Country	Nanjing University of Science and Technology, Pakistan