

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_97796
Title of the Manuscript:	Low-Carbohydrate, High-Fat Diets for Ultramarathon Running: A Review on Performance and Health Outcomes
Type of the Article	Review 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:

(<https://www.journalejfnfs.com/index.php/EJNFS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript is somewhat interesting by the ultramarathoners or some athletes who paid attention to dietary patterns on the performances and metabolic markers. However, there are many major issues to improve the manuscript as following. Title: The authors mentioned about difference levels of caloric distribution of diet. I do not think current title covers all those aspects since it is not only "low-carb, high fat diets". Please consider editing the title to cover all important variables in the manuscript. The abstract is ok. If the authors insist this article to be "systematically review", strongly recommend adding "PRISMA" diagram to explain what the criteria are used for systematically search (inclusion/exclusion criteria), which database the authors applied the searching, and how many articles were screened before coming to 21 final articles. This process will increase the validity of the manuscript. There are a lot of replicate statements about "vary in study design, sample size, duration, ...", "no negative effects on performance of health outcomes" without insufficient explanations. The markers represented "performances" must be mentioned and compared between studies. The methods represented the energy sources of the body must be explained (how the researchers found that the ultrarunners used fat or glycogen as an energy source). Again, the laboratory data or any clinical parameters for evaluations of "health outcomes" must be mentioned and compared between studies (how differences of the parameters, what were the standardized methods for measurement, etc.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The data presentation at the table 1 should be organized. Since all studies included ultramarathons, in the column of the participants should mentioned participants' genders or any useful data. What were the study design, comparator, and study duration of each study? The intervention should be mentioned as caloric distribution other than "high fat diet". The outcome presentation should be simplified for reader understanding. There are 2 rows of "Burke et al 2018", please confirm. There are many conflicts of data presentation. For example, topic 2.2 "Burke et al. (2018) found that a high-fat diet (57% fat, 22% carbohydrate, and 21% protein) improved the performance..." but the table 1 showed "High fat diet (50% fat, 25% carbohydrate)" at Burke 2018's row. "Cox et al. (2017) found no significant differences in performance..." but the table 1 showed "...improved performance..." at Cox et al's row. There are many more points than those mentioned above. Please carefully check. The topic 5 discussion can be omitted since it is currently duplicated of those prior paragraphs. The references are sufficient. However, I noticed the title of "Paoli, A., Grimaldi, K., D'Agostino, D., Cenci, L., Moro, T., Bianco, A., & Palma, A. (2012). Ketogenic diet does not affect strength performance in elite artistic gymnasts. Journal of the International Society of Sports Nutrition, 9(1), 34.", but the authors said quite out of the scope of that title. I did not read the full article. Please confirm. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	No issues at this point.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tippawan Siritientong
Department, University & Country	Chulalongkorn University, Thailand