



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_31805
Title of the Manuscript:	PREVALENCE AND PATTERN OF NUTRITIONAL STATUS OF ADOLESCENTS ATTENDING PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN A RURAL COMMUNITY IN RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA
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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Location of study should be part of the title of the article. 2. Et als should be italisised in the text 3. Line 89 -101 is not relevant to the subject matter and most be expunged. The Research has no relationship with that part of the introduction. 4. Line 106-117 should be streamlined in order to a summary of the location since the description is so long. 5. Line 140 the period is too short to have a comprehensive study/result 6. Line 162, religion has no bearing on eating or health habit of a population so must be removed 7. Line 181-184 must be removed 8. The references did not conform with Apa format in some cases Please clarify the ethical issue.	1. Location of study (Gokana) included in the title of the article. 2. All Et als in the text have been italisised 3. Line 89 – 101 expunged 4. Line 106 – 117 has been streamlined 5. The short period was partly due to volatility of the area. However, more research assistants were used to overcome this. 6. Line 162 removed 7. Line 181 – 184 also removed 8. The reference used is Vancouver referencing as stipulated by the journal and not APA.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	All my observations reflect complete removal of such parts from the article in order to make have scientific outlook	Thank you.