

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_116814
Title of the Manuscript:	Does the Dietary Diversity Score of Public Distribution System Beneficiaries Differ from Non-beneficiaries in Rural and Urban Telangana? A Comparative Study
Type of the Article	Original Research 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>With all pointed out corrections and revision put in place, it could be one.</p> <p>The title could better be written as; <b>Dietary Diversity Score among Beneficiaries and Non-beneficiaries of Public Distribution System in Rural and Urban Telangana</b></p> <p>The abstract needs to be re-written based on the pointed out corrections</p> <p>They are not, the study is an empirical one hence the format should be followed as shown: After Abstract, we should have; 1.Introduction, Statement of the Problem, purpose of the study/specific Objectives, Hypotheses (if any), 2. Under methodology; resign design, area of the study, population of the study, sample size and technique, instrument for data collection, validity /reliability, data collection and then, data analysis. 3. The result and discussion of the findings 4. Conclusion 5. Recommendation can now follow and then the references</p> <p>It needs major corrections to fit</p> <p>The references are sufficient, though there are about six that are too old, they should be replaced with recent ones</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>It is suitable as it can be clearly understood</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>It needs major revision to suit an empirical paper. The researcher should refer to the authors guide for guidance on some missing sub-sections such as Acknowledgement, competing interest, Authors' contributions</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Bello Monsurat</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Adeyemi Federal University of Education, Nigeria</b>