

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_103919
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative study on snacking behaviour of working and non-working women of Hisar City
Type of the 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.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

Yes

	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> <p>1. the manuscript important for Is scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p>	<p>Yes, but only to a very limited part of the scientific community. On one side, the manuscript offers an original research result which could be shared with the scientific community and the general public. Nonetheless, the sample chosen remains very limited both quantitatively and geographically. Furthermore, no real methodology has been adopted, which makes the analysis of the data collected from the simple results of the questionnaires (120 cases) subject to a form of imprecision and bias. It is difficult to extrapolate the results.</p> <p>On the substance of the subject, the author failed to explain that there are at least two main categories of school regarding the advantages and disadvantages of snacking and related behaviours...:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Those who advocate for 'nutritionally and calorically balanced snacks eaten' exclusively when someone is hungry. It may help feeding satiation while meeting nutrient requirements. For specialists, satiety control may also help with 'weight management.' 2. Those who advocate that 'Snacking can be unhealthy.' The main argument is as follows: frequently eating excessive amounts of snack foods can increase daily calorie intake resulting in weight gain, disorders in behaviours, etc. with special considerations for children, young people, women who does not practice sport, etc. the main risk of overweight and obesity and the development of an associated complexes related to abnormal eating habits, especially with low-income women educating their children 'alone' (Lumeng & Fisher, 2018). <p>No. The reasons for comparing snacking behaviours are not clear from the title. I suggest the following title: <i>Snacking Behaviour of Hisar City (North-Western India): Working and non-working women do not replace 'regular meals' by 'snacks'</i></p> <p>No. The abstract could be shortened in three main parts: 1/ What does this study seek to demonstrate and why? 2/ The methodology chosen and its advantages; and 3/ the main outcomes spilt into what is common and what is divergent.</p> <p>No. The minimum of the structure of the manuscript should highlight the following subsections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Abstract b. Keywords c. 1. Introduction d. 2. Methodology e. 3. Outcomes and Results f. 4. Discussion g. 5. The way forward h. 6. Conclusion & Recommendations <p>Right from the Abstract, a problem arises: the author must clarify what he/she means by "non-working women having an income" and "working women with an income." What about women without an income?</p> <p>Yes, but incomplete. Again, the outcomes and results cannot be considered outside Hisar City.</p> <p>It is crucial to clarify a definition of "Snacking Behavior" before making a reference to other authors.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

<p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The following definition could be considered or adjusted by the author: Snacking behaviour is related to is the consumption of food and drinks between regular meals. It can be influenced by various factors, such as hunger, availability of snacks, knowledge about healthy snacks, reasons for snacking, social environment, time of day, food culture, marketing, screen time, boredom, indulgence, and food insecurity. Snacking behavior can affect snack quality, overall diet quality, and body weight (usual definition in the dictionary).</p> <p>The Methodology is quite weak and failed to be convincing: the so-called randomized choice of working and non-working women should be further clarified. It often contributes to the introduction of 'uncontrolled mistakes such duplication of samples. A grid of the area and an equitable distribution of the women chosen in each geographical area of Hisar City would have offered greater credibility. Furthermore, there is no evidence to support direct or indirect correlations.</p> <p>Multiple regression analyses could have been conducted to determine the role of women's intention, habit, and self-control in predicting their healthy and unhealthy snacking behaviours. One of the missing outcomes/results related to both the influence of habit and self-control on snacking behaviour. Besides, a clear difference must be highlighted between women who are "knowledgeable" on healthy and unhealthy consequences of snacking, sweet or salty... The lack of "physical activities or sport" on one hand, and "stress at work" or "at home" on the other hand, should be considered as well.</p> <p>Regression analysis is part of a statistical method which helps for the estimation of the relationships between a dependent variable and one or more independent variables. It is quite appropriate in this case to study how changing variables affect an outcome of interest, highlighting which factors matter most, which can be ignored, and how they interact with each other. All those aspects are missing and may improve drastically the manuscript, especially for the scientific community.</p> <p>Finally, the absence of a taxonomy, a scheme of hierarchical classification, structured into se two main groups (working women and non-working women) and two types (knowledgeable women on snacking risks (healthy and unhealthy) could help clarifying the matter. Additional classification on the motivations that lead to snacking would have made it possible to be more precise.</p> <p>The table 1 should be clarified with an explanation on the percentage. Besides, the way forward is missing as well.</p> <p>No. It seems that the references are not up-to-date. Additional references are suggested.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Aarts, H., & Dijksterhuis, A. (2000). Habits as knowledge structures: Automaticity in goal-directed behaviour. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>, 78, 53– 63. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.78.1.532. Aarts, H., Verplanken, B., & Van Knippenberg, A. (1998). Predicting behaviour from actions in the past: Repeated decision making or a matter of habit? <i>Journal of Applied Social Psychology</i>, 28, 1355– 1374. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.1998.tb01681.x3. Arefi, Y. (2023). Snacking Bakes: Simple Recipes for Cookies, Bars, Brownies, Cakes, and More. Forthcoming in November 7, 2023. Clarkson Potter: New York4. Charlesworth, J., Green, A., & Mullan (2022). 'Exploring rational and automatic processes in parents' snack and beverage provision: The role of self-control, intention, and counter-intentional habit, <i>Appetite</i>.' In <i>Appetite</i>. Volume 178, 1 November 2022, No. of the article106185, 2022. Accessed 31 July 2023. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2022.106185. Accessed 31 July 2023. Retrieved from https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0195666322002768?via%3Dihub5. De Castro, J. M. (2000). 'Eating behaviour: Lessons from the real world of humans'. In <i>Ingestive Behavior and Obesity</i>, Volume 16, pp. 800–813. Accessed 31 July 2023. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/S0899-9007(00)00414-7	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.7

	<p>6. Korinth, A., Schiess, S., & Westenhoefer, J. (2009). Eating behaviour and eating disorders in students of nutrition sciences. In <i>Public Health Nutrition</i>, Vol. 13, pp. 32– 37. Accessed 31 July 2023. Retrieved from https://doi:10.1017/S1368980009005709</p> <p>7. Lumeng, J. C. & Fisher, J. O. (Editors) (2018). <i>Pediatric Food Preferences and Eating Behaviors</i> 1st Edition. Academic Press: London.</p> <p>8. Verhoeven, A. A. C., Adriaanse, M. A., Evers, C., & De Ridder, D. T. D. (2012). 'The power of habits: Unhealthy snacking behaviour is primarily predicted by habit strength'. In <i>The British Journal of Health Psychology</i>. Volume 17, Issue 4., November 2012, pp. 758-770. Accessed 31 July 2023. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8287.2012.02070</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. A final editing could improve the paper.	
Optional/General comments	The general impression is that the conclusion is a general one, and that we have missed the real problem, which is the establishment of habits in behaviour, quite apart from any consideration of whether snacking is harmful or not. According to the past research, 'the power of habits' is directly correlated to 'unhealthy snacking behaviour' and 'habit strength' (Lumen\g & Fisher, 2018); De Castro, 2000).	

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:	Yves Ekoué Amaïzo
Department, University & Country	Austria