

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_110423
Title of the Manuscript:	Epidemiological-clinical profiles of severely acutely malnourished children aged 6 to 59 months: cases of the Notre Dame des Apôtres hospital in N'Djamena (Chad)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	 1- The manuscript will give information about SAM in Chad, but this information was known in the literature for other countries. However, it is good to know more about different places of the world with different malnutrition settings and contributing factors. Furthermore, it can highlight the problem to the local/national authorities to try find solutions. 2- In my opinion it is better to change the title to reflect the study well. E.g. Severe Acute Malnutrition in children under five of age in Chad settings. 3- The abstract is reasonable with some changes required. I did mention it in the manuscript word file attached. 4- Subsections and structure are acceptable. However, subsections of the method I think are extra (for example can be under one section (method), subsections can be paragraphs under it, like study population, study design, analysisetc) 5- The concept is good but the analysis and results still need more work with adding correlations of SAM with other factors like vaccination, complications, parents' employment and breastfeeding....etc. 6- Most of the references are web reference with no links was inserted, and not sure which reference system was used? If no system was used and inserted manual this is must be changed with use more published papers than web references.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality was not strong, many sentences still needed to be adjusted to get a nice flow and easy to understand. On the figures and graphs there was other languages was used, need to be adjusted to English.	
Optional/General comments	In general, the manuscript concept is good but minor changes in the structure and language. But major changes required for analysis better if biostatistician available to do correlations between factors.	

Review Form 1.7

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nagib N O Geddara
Department, University & Country	University of Stellenbosch, South Africa