



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_65983
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutrition education of mothers and zinc supplementation among children in the rural community, Cameroon
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	PLEASE, SEE MY COMMENTS IN THE MANUSCRIPT.	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Introduction To participate in this wide program and improve nutritional status of the children, the purpose of this study was to assess the impact of zinc supplementation and nutrition education of children' mothers in the Bangang rural community.- Please consider to reformulate the sentence. « to participate... this study was conducted » and describe properly the purpose of the study.</p> <p>Conclusion The study was showed a positive impact of maternal education and zinc supplementation. - Please correct the verb form « the study showed »</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>This is a very interesting study with important contribution on nutrition public health interventions. The purpose of the study was to assess the impact of two interventions (zinc supplementation of children and nutrition education of mothers) on nutritional status of children in the Bangang rural community, which was evaluated based on significant statistically differences before and after interventions. However, reading the manuscript is not facilitated, since the variables under study were not clearly described. I believe that the manuscript could be improved, specially the methods and the discussion sections.</p>	

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:	Liliane Costa
Department, University & Country	Portugal