

Review Form 1.6

m

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_77738
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of the dietitian/nutritionist role in Khartoum state hospitals-Sudan
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>It is accurate to call this an 'assessment' (as opposed to a 'study'). What is less clear is whether such an assessment truly qualifies for publication within a scientific journal. From Francis Bacon onwards, science has been driven by the formulation and experimental evaluation of specific hypotheses. This manuscript does report a few conclusions, but there are no well articulated hypotheses that effectively establish what is to be gained in collecting and reporting this assessment data.</p> <p>One legitimate research questions might be, "Does the status and responsibilities of dieticians within Khartoum have any statistical bearing on health outcomes?"</p> <p>Pursuit of a question like this would require collection of health outcome statistics that could be examined for statistical relationships with dietetic services. That would certainly require more work, but would tremendously amplify the value of this work.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>There are a great number of formatting and minor grammatical errors. The manuscript should be carefully proofed by someone with fluency in English technical report writing.</p> <p>The relatively high rate of survey noncompliance is somewhat problematic, since people and institutions that respond to surveys may not be fully representative of the institutions as a whole. For instance, people who voluntarily complete a given survey are more likely to be those who have more favorable answers to report. This weakness should, at the very least, be acknowledged.</p>	
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:	Gerald Lushington
Department, University & Country	Kansas State University, USA