

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_122972
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge on nutrition and hygiene of rural women of Assam
Type of the Article	Original article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is of significant importance to the scientific community as it addresses a critical gap in public health research. By focusing on the rural women of Assam, this study provides valuable insights into the socio-cultural determinants of health in a vulnerable population. The findings contribute to a better understanding of the intersection between nutrition, hygiene, and rural livelihoods, which is essential for developing targeted interventions. I appreciate this manuscript because it highlights the need for context-specific strategies in improving public health outcomes and empowers rural communities through knowledge dissemination.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, however consider revising it to: Nutrition Knowledge and hygiene practices of rural women of Assam	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Consider including some background information of the title.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>Introduction; The section lacks crucial information regarding the knowledge on nutrition, which is a key variable of the study. Additionally, it does not justify the importance of the study or clearly identify the existing problem that necessitates the research. These elements are essential to set the context and significance of the study. I recommend revising the introduction to include a discussion on the current state of knowledge on nutrition among the population of interest, as well as a clear rationale for why this study is important and how it addresses an existing gap or problem in the field.</p> <p>Methods: Simplify the area of study for the reader to understand how the villages were selected</p> <p>Discussion: The article lacks discussion a very crucial section to compare the study findings and other authors' findings. Consider incorporating this section. The article is incomplete without this section.</p> <p>Conclusion: This section seems to have some element of discussion though not well done. A conclusion should be very precise on the take home point. What are the key points to note about the study and should be brief.</p>	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article needs revision to meet the minimum requirements of a scientific article that is bridging a key gap.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	After incorporating literature review under introduction and discussion, the reference list should be revised.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Average	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Phyllis Waruguru
Department, University & Country	Kabarak University, Kenya