

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_113226
Title of the Manuscript:	A Gendered Perspective on Household Dietary Diversity Status in Mbinga District, Tanzania
Type of the Article	Research study

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>Women's work in farming, child feeding practices and nutritional status among under-five children in rural Rukwa, Tanzania (2015) Determinants of dietary diversity and the potential role of men in improving household nutrition in Tanzania (2017)</p> <p>2. The title is suitable The influence of feeding practices on under five nutrition status in Mbinga district, Tanzania (2023) chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.internationalscholarsjournals.com/articles/the-influence-of-feeding-practices-on-under-five-nutrition-status-in-mbinga-district-tanzania.pdf</p> <p>4. The structure of the manuscript is appropriate but the part of findings and interpretation are not so well structured, and one more - a very small part of conclusion. The part of recommendations is far from the topic.</p> <p>5. From my view the manuscript is scientifically correct but needed to be improved. 6. The references are sufficient and recent, lots of them are recent and actual.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The level of English is suitable for scholarly publication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>After reading the article «A Gendered Perspective on Household Dietary Diversity Status in Mbinga District, Tanzani» we would like to receive the answer to the next questions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why a Male-headed homes had a high level of dietary diversity ? Maybe because of their social status, how many children they have, do their wife are working? What are the main reasons and dependent factors ? 2. Why a Female-headed homes had a less level of dietary diversity ? Maybe because of their marital status, are they married? how many children they have, do their husband are working? 3. The last part – recommendation- «Based on the findings of this study, the Tanzanian government is advised to develop gender-responsive programs aimed at granting equal access to food, productive resources, education, decision-making authority, and economic possibilities throughout food value chains for both men and women». This recommendation a very general and not focused to the current issues based on this article. 	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Svetlana Gurieva
Department, University & Country	Saint Petersburg State University, Russia