



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRNH_60609
Title of the Manuscript:	RELATIONSHIP OF KNOWLEDGE OF NUTRITION IN FOOD AND ECONOMIC STATUS WITH CHRONIC ENERGY LACK OF PREGNANT WOMEN IN SELATAN KONAWA DISTRICT
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://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



[SDI 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>ABSTRACT: 1- Authors cannot use any abbreviation that was not explained before. 2- According to the presented numbers above the final result is not correct. It must be clear how the authors came to this result. 3- The description of the results is definitely not clear. Needs rewriting. 4- "Keywords" - The words presented here are not keywords.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION: 1- It is strongly advised the paper needs correction considering the English language. 2- There are many mistakes in the use of abbreviation that can lead to difficulties for the reader comprehension. 3- There are several studies references that are not referred to in the text.</p> <p>METHOD: 1- It is necessary to review the number of evaluated participants. On my math the total population was 1260. Please review! 2- It is not clear how authors reached the number of evaluated people. It requires better explanations. 3- It is necessary a better description about the instruments used. Which questionnaires were used? Are these questionnaires standardized or developed for this research? It is important to remember that, if they were developed for this research, the paper might lose credibility.</p> <p>RESULTS: 1- It is not clear how nutritional knowledge in food was evaluated, which makes it difficult to replicate this research.</p> <p>DISCUSSION: 1- In some topics of the discussion many results were presented that had already been described in Results. I suggest that they be revised. 2- Citations were made to some bibliographic references that were not included in the Bibliography. It is necessary to revise.</p> <p>BIBLIOGRAPHY: It is necessary to review.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>ABSTRACT: 1- The "Conclusion" needs to be revised, long sentences easily lead to not clear comprehension. "Puskesmas" - It is necessary to be clear the meaning of this word.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION: 1- Some sentences are repetitive and also confusing, especially the second and fifth paragraphs. It is suggested to synthesize some paragraphs pointing to the most relevant aspects. Introduction also needs a lot of correction. 2- It would be better that the aim was described the same way the abstract was.</p> <p>METHOD: 1- It is not clear how the data was collected. It would be important to describe it better, in order to allow the replication of this research.</p> <p>RESULTS: 1- Tables were not built correctly. Please review.</p> <p>DISCUSSION: 1- In this topic, I wonder if the lack of knowledge about nutrients in food will result in respondents not paying attention to the consumption of nutritious foods to prevent KEK. Maybe the lack of knowledge can, by itself, results in inadequate consumption and the lack of attention to the consumption are related to other aspects that could be better investigated.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>In a general way, the paper looks good. However, it will be necessary to make many corrections throughout the article. The methodological design is correct, but relevant information is missing.</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Graziela A. Nogueira de Almeida Ribeiro
Department, University & Country	Centro Universitário Barão de Mauá, Brasil