

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_95504
Title of the Manuscript:	The Lack of Nutritional Competency among the Medical Practitioners and Medical Students: A Systematic Review
Type of the Article	Systematic Review

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:

(<https://journalejns.com/index.php/EJNFS/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. Yes, the manuscript is important, but the author has not systematically documented the data from the review. There are only descriptions. 2. Title is appropriate. 3. The article is comprehensive, but no basis for the discussion 4. The format of the article should be according to journal guidelines 5. Scientifically correct 6. References are sufficient 7. Details pertaining to the articles used for the article could be given. Eg. Author name, year, country, medical school, specialisation of the medical persons etc.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Jemima Beryl Mohankumar
Department, University & Country	PSG College of Arts & Science, India