

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_119456
Title of the Manuscript:	THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE LEVEL OF NUTRITIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND FAT INTAKE TO CHOLESTEROL LEVELS IN PT EMPLOYEES BOLAANG MONGONDOW DISTRICT TOURISM MANAGEMENT
Type of the Article	

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE LEVEL OF NUTRITIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND FAT INTAKE TO CHOLESTEROL LEVELS IN PT EMPLOYEES BOLAANG MONGONDOW DISTRICT TOURISM MANAGEMENT</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title and Abstract: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The title is clear and indicates the primary variables of interest. However, it might be more precise to specify the nature of the relationship studied (e.g., correlation or association). ○ The abstract is comprehensive, but it could benefit from a more concise presentation. Consider summarizing the key findings and their implications in fewer words. 2. Introduction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The introduction provides a good background on the importance of the study and its context. It effectively outlines the relevance of nutritional knowledge and fat intake to cholesterol levels. ○ There are minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasings. For example, "The development of companies in Indonesia is increasingly rapid as time goes by" could be rephrased for clarity and conciseness. 3. Method: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The methodology section is detailed and clearly outlines the study design, population, sample size, and data collection methods. This clarity is commendable. ○ Consider providing more detail on the Slovin formula and why it was chosen for sample size determination. 4. Results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The results are well-organized and presented in tables, which aids in understanding the findings. ○ The interpretation of the statistical tests is clear, but it would be beneficial to explain the practical significance of the findings. For instance, what does it mean for employees' health and company policies that there is no relationship between nutritional knowledge and fat intake, but a significant relationship between fat intake and cholesterol levels? 5. Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The discussion section appropriately interprets the findings in the context of existing literature. However, it could be strengthened by discussing the potential reasons for the lack of a relationship between nutritional knowledge and fat intake. ○ Consider addressing the implications of the findings for public health interventions and workplace health promotion programs. 6. Conclusion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The conclusion succinctly summarizes the key findings. However, it should also include recommendations for future research and practical applications based on the study's results. 7. References: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ensure that all references cited in the text are included in the reference list and formatted consistently according to the journal's guidelines. ○ It would be beneficial to include more recent studies to support the discussion points and enhance the relevance of the findings. 	

Review Form 1.7

	8. Overall: <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The manuscript addresses an important topic with potential implications for employee health and productivity. With some minor revisions for clarity, conciseness, and depth of discussion, it has the potential to make a valuable contribution to the field.	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General 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:	K. Mano Sakthi
Department, University & Country	Alagappa University College of Physical Education, India