

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_116251
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Nutritional Status in Post- Menopausal Women of Ayodhya District, U.P.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalejns.com/index.php/EJNFS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>	<p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. I could not say that the manuscript scientifically correct since there are many errors and lacking in interpreting results of statistical tests</p> <p>6. Yes</p> <p>Abstract section line number 2: The sample comprised of not only rural but also urban post-menopausal women as well. Should be refined accordingly.</p> <p>Abstract section line number 5: The expansion of abbreviation BMI must be given.</p> <p>Abstract section line number 5: It seems like weight could not reach statistical significance. Should be checked.</p> <p>Abstract section line number 14: The abbreviation RDA was written before; so, the expansion of the abbreviation must be given where it appears the first in the text.</p> <p>Introduction section the last line: The aim of the study must be given in detail in the last paragraph of the Introduction section.</p> <p>Material Method section line number 5-6: How was the sample size determined?</p> <p>Material Method section line number 10 the sentence starting as "The BMI of the respondents shall be calculated...": Past tense should be used and the whole manuscript should be checked accordingly.</p> <p>Material Method section BMI equation: The equations should be given using equation function of Microsoft Word.</p> <p>Material Method section Adequacy of food subsection line number 2 the sentence starting as "For dietary assessment, Arabic Food Frequency...": The relevant citation is not included in references section. The DOI link of the validation study: 10.1016/j.jand.2013.08.019</p> <p>Material Method section Adequacy of food subsection line number 5-6 the sentence starting as "Food lists in the modified FFQ ...": The spelling rules must be strictly tracked alongside the manuscript. There are many errata and punctuation errors.</p> <p>Table 1: The abbreviation SDI should be written in full where it appears the first in the text.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>The last paragraph of Material Method section the sentence starting as: “Statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS and Microsoft Excel”: The abbreviations should be written in full where they appear the first in the text. In apart from that, the version numbers of the software should be indicated.</p> <p>The last paragraph of Material Method section the sentence starting as: “Statistical comparisons of means among groups were performed using ANOVA and t-tests, with differences considered statistically significant at p < 0.05”: Why did you choose parametric tests? Do the continuous variables show normal distribution? If so, which normality test was used?</p> <p>Table 2: It would be better if Chi-squared test was used to reveal statistical significance of the distribution.</p> <p>Results and Discussion section the first, second, and third paragraphs: Table 2 already gives the idea mentioned here. These paragraphs should be removed.</p> <p>The paragraph under the Table 3 the sentence starting as: “In mean height (cm), Mean weight(kg) and BMI (kg/m2).”: The sentence should be removed.</p> <p>The paragraph under the Table 3 the sentence starting as: “The Height, Weight and BMI of Urban women was higher than rural women”: It would be wrong to indicate that the weight of the urban women was higher than those of rural because it did not reach the statistical significance. This result may stem from merely chance.</p> <p>Table 4: Chi-squared test could be useful to make stronger inference about the differences in the distribution of literacy between rural and urban people. If it is impossible, it must be indicated.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The authors are strongly encouraged that they receive English grammar support since the manuscript has currently not enough English quality to be published in an academic environment. In addition, there are major errata and punctuation errors alongside the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hasan Memiş
Department, University & Country	Inonu University, Türkiye