

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_EJNFS_113501 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Nutritional Status and its Predictors of Rural Women in Dharwad Taluk, Karnataka |
| 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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for 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>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> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript is important for the scientific community, particularly in the field of food and nutritional science. The title is okay; however, it is suggested to be revised as “Rural Women’s Nutritional Status and its Predictors in Dharwad Taluk, Karnataka”. The abstract should maintain a flow and represent the key components of the research. It should be revised highlighting objectives, measurement techniques, key findings and a conclusive statement and recommendation. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be appropriate. However, the formatting should be carefully done, spacing should be accurate. Yes, it is scientifically correct. The references are not sufficient and recent, especially in the introduction section. The methodology section fails to represent the methodological measurement of variables, rationale for sample selection, sampling procedure. It is recommended to specify the above-mentioned issues. The results presented in the table should not be repeated in the text. Tables are self-explanatory. Throughout the manuscript the results are repeated from the table. There are references of the previous work associated with the particular findings, however no discussion of the researchers themselves. The conclusion is the repetition of the results section, moreover no recommendations were also made. | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | English quality of the article is suitable. | |
| <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: | Susmita Sarmin |
| Department, University & Country | Hajee Mohammad Danesh Science and Technology University, Bangladesh |