

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_122243
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing the Nutritional Impact of Cannabinoids in Patients with Advanced Cancer
Type of the Article	Original Research 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

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	Cancer is one of the public health problems with the greatest scope and severity for people; scientific production in this regard is of great help to contribute to improving their quality of life. Treatment alternatives can diversify and personalize cancer management in patients. The study must specify all the procedures carried out in various sections, so that they can be replicated in other contexts.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Clarify some points made in the manuscript	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Some are missing in methodology, for a complete report	
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 study must clarify several points that are necessary and pertinent about the procedures carried out. The strength of the study can be achieved by complementing and improving the different sections of the manuscript. The importance and relevance of the study must be explicit in the manuscript.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	They are not enough for this type of articles, update the corresponding ones	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Can be improved	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Improve the coherence and cohesion of the text in the different sections of the 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:	Jose Ander Asenjo Alarcon
Department, University & Country	National Autonomous University of Chota, Peru