



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_64977
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPROVING FOOD CHOICES OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHILDREN USING NUTRISCIE-CARD GAME
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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In methodology part, <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) why choose only 3 schools for validation and only one school for effectiveness? b) Why only 18 school children age as respondent? any sample size calculations? Whether they are in both validation and effectiveness phases? c) Study period not mentioned? d) In third last paragraph its written experiment and control <i>treatment</i>. while this is a pre-post design study... No treatment is there? 2. In result part, its written in last line of description of table 3: that "No change (preferred) was noted to soft drinks, fruit drinks, canned goods and processed foods." While in table 3 there written improved choices. 3. In discussion part , almost like literature view or finding of the study...No comparative study mentioned? 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In introduction part, something about NUTRISCIE-CARD GAME or its importance should be there 2. In methodology part, in 1st paragraph its written 4 phases but described only 3 phases 	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It's a good study 	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Amit Sachdeva
Department, University & Country	Indira Gandhi Medical College, Shimla, India