



SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>1. The paper is well designed and the issue treated is very important, but the statistical treatment of the data has not been conducted properly, as one of the two reviewers already noted in the first revision.</p> <p>2. Some conclusions are not supported by the statistical results. E.g. "Women had higher score for average unhealthy habits in rural (33.2%) and transition (35.4%)." But some phrases after is reported : " Statistically significant difference for average unhealthy habit score was noticed only in urban (t=1.96 *).</p> <p>3. The authors compare men and women (two groups) in three different contests but they compare also the groups within the different contests.</p> <p>As an example, the authors affirm: "Fasting on religious belief was more practiced by transition women (56%), compared to rural (26%) and urban (28%). Consumption of health supplements was more among women, especially in urban (34%) compared to men" or "Consumption of tea or coffee was more among men along the rural-urban gradient" or " Unhealthy food habits are highest among rural women which is gradually decreased towards urban" by only a t test. A comparison within different environments is necessary but requires a two way ANOVA followed by a post hoc test.</p> <p>I hope that the authors revise their work and re-submit it</p>	<p>Since questionnaire was in 'Yes' or 'No' format, expression of results in terms of percentage was considered appropriate.</p> <p>Suitable statistical test according to the editorial comments is applied. Slight modifications were made in the manuscript according to the findings.</p>