

# *ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend as part of the revision.

***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: Dec. 9, 2015	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:
Manuscript Title:	
<b>Review: Protein Intake During Breastfeeding, Complementary and Pre-school Periods</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 12129/15	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>A review article title is adequate to the keywords of the article</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Result sub-section is not available; the author should add this section to the abstract</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>English is mostly understandable</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The method sub-section is available in the abstract, but it's not available in the text. We can't accept that in the original research article, but we can accept it in the review article.</i>	

<b>5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The summary is accurate and supported by the content</i>	
<b>6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Page 9, Please cite this sentence "...WHO published a worldwide recommendation in 2001..."</i> <i>Page 7, Please add the date for "Mihreshahi et al. concluded that the key mechanisms that explain these findings..."</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	*
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

1. *Result sub-section is not available; the author should add this section to the abstract*
2. *The method sub-section is available in the abstract, but it's not available in the text. We can't accept that in the original research article, but we can accept it in the review article.*
3. *Abstract, Conclusion, please define BMI*
4. *Please add numbering for headings and sub-heading titles*
5. *Page 7, Please add the date for "Mihreshahi et al. concluded that the key mechanisms that explain these findings..."*
6. *Page 9, Please cite this sentence "...WHO published a worldwide recommendation in 2001..."*
7. *Page 12, Please add the date for "use the studies identified by Hornell et al. as points..."*
8. *"A very recent and comprehensive systematic review by Hornell et al. (2013)" it's not a very recent.*
9. *Abstract "In searching for applicable articles, the search has been done using..." Not have been*
10. *Please add a 3 to 5 keywords after the abstract*
11. *Page 4, last paragraph, no need for the quotation, please review and reword the sentence.*

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:.....**