



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Nutrition &amp; Food Safety</a>
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> )

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>After all the reading, there are some doubts that should be better detailed for the appropriate publication of the manuscript. I list below:</p> <p>1 - The abstract speaks of 100 mothers but in the point "2.10" it was said that only 75 mothers participated in nutritional education. What value is correct? 2 – In the chapter "Results and Discussion", it is said that of the 150 children, 100 children were submitted to nutritional education. What was the method employed for this? In "material and methods" there is no such description. 3 – Still in this item, it is said that 50 children received zinc supplementation, but soon after it is said that there were 25 children. What value is correct?</p> <p>I believe it is important to review how the text was written in order to clear these doubts. If there are adjustments, also review the statistical data.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>After the proper adjustments of the text for better clarification and statistical data (if necessary), the manuscript will be able to publish, because the findings are of extreme scientific and social relevance.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>This is a current, highly relevant and relevant research. Beforehand, I congratulate the entire research team for their sensitivity in choosing the tema.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b> <b>EXISTEM QUESTÕES ÉTICAS?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> Yes. Because it is a research with human beings, the authors confirmed that the study was previously submitted to the National Ethics Committee of Cameroon and meets international ethical standards.	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Lincoln Vitor Santos</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal University of Sergipe, Brazil</b>