



SDI Review Form 1.6

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_33276
Title of the Manuscript:	Climate change and its impact on nutritional status and health of children
Type of the Article	Review paper

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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	The author classify the paper as a review paper. However the paper is far away from being a review paper. A review paper should be as actual as possible, but there is only one citation from 2015 and no one after it. We are already in 2017, yet in many places the authors use prediction for 2015. Another example, in the paragraph starting at line 72 the author comment on change over the half century and present only two references, one from 1982 an another from 2001. As a review paper the authors should provide as much reference as possible. Just to stay in the Introduction: what is the reference for the 2.5 billion people data line 44; and for the prediction presented at line 51-52. The authors only pay attention to extreme weather events, but increase/decrease of the average temperature can have a large impact, for instance via agricultural impact. The authors should also present more quantitative data and comment on how the world	I have tried my best to make it look actual. Rest have taken care of wherever necessary Done the needful Reference quoted Presently the problem seems to be of increasd temperature so that is y more discussion on increased temperature. Added more quantitative data
Minor REVISION comments	Figure 1 must be corrected. Some words are cut and the third arrow in the second column looks to be misplaced.	Nothing is missing in the figure ,arrow I have corrected

SDI Review Form 1.6

	2. When more than one references are cited, they should be given in a certain order, generally by year. 3. I don't know whether the journal has a format for the references, but they should be consistent.	Rest modified as per the journal
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		