

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_112340
Title of the Manuscript:	The Role of Functional Foods and Nutraceuticals in Disease Prevention and Health Promotion
Type of the Article	

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? 2. Is the title of the article suitable? 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.	1. The manuscript is the start of an investigation into the studies already published on the benefits of consuming functional foods and nutraceuticals. The manuscript needs some adaptations so that the reader can have a better understanding of the research proposal. 2. I think the title represents the proposal of the work, but it could be adjusted because it's looking like a textual sentence and not the title of a scientific paper. And what can lead to disease prevention and health promotion is consumption, not just the fact that these foods exist. Title suggestion: Consumption of functional foods and nutraceuticals: Role in Disease Prevention and Health Promotion 3. The summary needs few adjustments. My suggestions follow in the manuscript comments. 4. The structure of the manuscript is good. With just a few caveats: it would be interesting to number the sections; the “Results” and “Discussion” sections could be placed in the same section: “Results and Discussion”; It would be feasible to have a methodology section detailing that an exploratory qualitative research methodology was carried out. 5. The manuscript needs some adjustments to make it clearer to the reader, especially in relation to the aims which are not clear in the writing. My suggestions are in the comments of the Word file. 6. References need to be updated. Only about 16% are from the last 5 years. Many references are more than 20 years old. For a theoretical review this is not very interesting.	OKAY OKAY OKAY OKAY
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It would be interesting for the text to be revised to avoid repetitive parts and also to remove confusing parts.	NOTED
Optional/General comments	Some adaptations and doubts need to be resolved and clarified so that the manuscript has more solid scientific characteristics, especially in relation to the research aims. My doubts and suggestions can be found in the comments on the original manuscript. I recommend that the manuscript only be published if the suggested changes are made.	NOTED

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)	