

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_118917
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparing the prevalence of food, water borne. parenterally acquired viral hepatitis in the tribal, non-tribal north east Indian population and its prevalence pre-COVID and during COVID
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The study's main aim is to compare hepatitis infection in pre-covid and during covid era, however, the study methodology and results were not accurate enough to meet the aim. 2. yes 3. No. the results section is not representing the main results of the article. 4. No, the abstract is not limited to 250-300 words, the introduction is not sub sectioned to background, problem statement, gaps in previous knowledge, proposed solution, literatures reviews, and aim. The methods are not sub-sectioned, no statistical analysis is mentioned. The results are missing information related to biochemical tests mentioned in table 2 of methods. Results of a, b, e, f, g, h, i, j are not mentioned in the methods. Discussion of such results also are missing. 5. No, the study design needs improvement. The methods should be clear and reproducible, statistical analysis should be used. The methods should precisely describe the patients age, gender, socioeconomical status, foods and cultural habits. 6. Some of the references are missing. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The English language is poor. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	non	

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:	Zahraa Kamaz
Department, University & Country	Iraq