

Paper: **“Impact of dietary Diversification on the nutritional status of children aged 0 to 59 months in the municipality of ToriBossito”**

Submitted: 29 June 2024

Accepted: 26 September 2024

Published: 30 September 2024

Corresponding Author: Parfait Alohoutade

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n27p136](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n27p136)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Bawa Boya
Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Benin

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer 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 peer 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 recommended as part of the revision. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Bawa BOYA	
University/Country: University of Abomey-Calavi	
Date Manuscript Received: 20/08/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 30/08/2024
Manuscript Title: Impact of dietary diversification on the nutritional status of children aged 0 to 59 months in the municipality of Tori-Bossito	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 17	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<i>The impact is often tangible and immediate, while the influence is more subtle and can manifest itself over a longer period. Comments. I suggest you use influence instead of impact</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
<i>The abstract lacks the objective of the work</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>I suggest that the author reread the article and follow the Journal guide</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>The study methods are not clear. There are 0-5 years and sometimes 0-23 months. hamonised the methodology.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
Nothing to report	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>revise the summary by adding the objective</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(References incorrectly listed in the text of the article)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The author needs to revise the problematic of the article. The author needs to tell us what more is being added to GERME, a Non-Governmental Organisation.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Nothing

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer 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 peer 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 recommended as part of the revision. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 26 Août 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 26 Août 2024
Manuscript Title: Impact de la diversification alimentaire sur l'état nutritionnel des enfants de 0 à 59 mois dans la commune de Tori-Bossito.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 13	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Oui	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	Oui
<i>(Des activités en rapport avec la diversification alimentaire ont été réalisées et mesurées)</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	Oui
<i>(l'objectifs n'est pas clair. Il faut le reformuler, le changer)</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	Oui
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	Oui
<i>(Methodes comprehensives car bien présentées)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	Non

<i>(Les résultats sont encombrés avec la discussion. De ce fait, ils sont difficilement perceptibles. Je suggère qu'ils soient regroupés et isolés de la discussion.)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	Oui
<i>(Cependant, elle ne contient pas de perspective. Il faut retirer les résultats.)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	Oui
<i>(Cependant, tout le document comporte peu de références. Ces références ne sont pas récentes pour la plupart)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Le travail est pertinent et doit être suffisamment soutenu et référencé par des travaux d'autres auteurs.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: