

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_122555
Title of the Manuscript:	Overweight school children in the urban community of Niamey according to their eating habits, level of physical activity and social and economic characteristics
Type of the 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 quite important in context to nutritional status of children, as it is emphasizing both on undernutrition and overweight/obesity at same time. Also, the variables used in study are quite significant to reflect on nutritional status of children.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Since undernutrition and overweight/obesity both are assessed I personally believe the terminology of double burden of malnutrition to be used	
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.	Satisfactory	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Satisfactory	
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 manuscript is good, but I would like to give few suggestions. If possible, kindly modify, as it will make manuscript more reflective and inferential: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How is the sample size calculated, please mention? 2. Cluster survey and sampling method need to be explained. If possible, add a flow chart for same. 3. Can results be stratified in early, med and late adolescent category. Add sub-group descriptive analysis 4. Comment upon the normality of continuous variables and also mention the specific test used to assess any significant differences or associations 5. How table 2 has multiple p-values as the sub-groups are drawn from total sample only 6. Table 3,4,5,6. Rather than only mentioning p-value, better to calculate unadjusted odd ratios with Confidence interval 7. Table: Multinomial regression will give more interpretative results, if possible kindly apply 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Need to be checked for chronology of citations	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is suitable, but I would like to advise to run any plagiarism software to check for similarity index. Discussion, methodology and result should be in past tense.	
Optional/General comments	If recommendations added, it may improve inferential value of manuscript. Rest may be published, in present form as its overall satisfactory manuscript.	

Review Form 3

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:	Mukesh Shukla
Department, University & Country	India