SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_56629
Title of the Manuscript:	Food Consumption Practices of Men and Women across Rural-Urban Interface of South Indian Megacity Bangalore
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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/30/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		
	Abstract: Is recommended to give the number for the total participants and for both genders. Data collection: What were the criteria for inclusion and exclusion of respondents? What the authors understand by "standardization" of questionnaire? Validation or checking for understanding by respondents? Healthy and unhealthy habits and Health and Nutrition - reader strongly needs more information on these as not a standardized assessment methods / questionnaires were used? Statistical analysis: What software was used? Was the data checked for normal distribution as t-student test is used in data with normal distribution. What was the p value? Table 1:	
	Please explain abbreviation: GLV. What is "t" test value? p value or other value? 1.69 or 1.96 are rather unusual scores for t student test? Please check.	
Minor REVISION comments	Introduction: It would be beneficial for the reader to indicate differences and similarities in selected eating behaviors in the studied country to western countries. Materials and methods: Inserting the flow chart with the study design would be recommended (e.g. see Consort diagram for quidelines).	
Optional/General comments	Please check the text for typing errors (e.g. double dots).	

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Joanna Myszkowska-Ryciak
Department, University & Country	Warsaw University of Life Sciences, Poland

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)