

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_128907
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutritional Knowledge, Dietary Practices and Consumption Pattern of Fruits and Vegetables among In-school Adolescents in LAUTECH International College, Ogbomoso, Oyo State, Nigeria.
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>

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript have importance because nutrition problems are common among adolescent. Adolescents should follow healthy eating habits to promote their health and to prevent health issues including obesity. Micronutrient deficiency have serious consequences especially among adolescent girls, and fruits and vegetables eating habits can reduce this problem. This manuscript prevail that more than four out of 10 adolescent do not have adequate knowledge and good eating practices which portrait serious condition and demand interventions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Dietary Practices and Consumption Pattern seems to have similar meaning but it is acceptable since consumption pattern is separately assessed.	
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.	Conclusion should be based on the results provided, please rewrite and make it coherent with the provided information in result.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript have many areas to improve but it is not scientifically incorrect.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Some references are too old	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It is acceptable but needed to improve for publication</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Very old references can be used in rare findings but in introduction section, some references are quite old for citation and there are updated information available, so use updated information as much as possible. 2. There is no study design named "Descriptive cross sectional" make it clear. 3. Why and how did you use stratified random sampling? Explain in detail. 4. Are you sure that SPSS means "Statistical Product and Service Solution", If the named changed provide details, and did you buy it or your organization provides you? 5. Was there any inclusion exclusion criteria? Study time? Your study tool validation process? 6. What about consent and assent from the participants, make it clear in case of participants below the age of 8 years? 7. Full form of SSS/JSS while writing first time. 8. Instead of Father's/ mothers highest level of education, it is better to write educational status of father/mother 9. In classification like age, allowances, clear the cutoff point by using symbols like ≤ instead of just <, to ensure no value are missing in classification. 10. Use grammar appropriately 11. In table 2, you can't use question as row heading 12. Knowledge are better to write as adequate and inadequate 13. In table 4 "1-3x/weeks" is not clear, make it easily understandable for readers 14. In discussion, you just simple compare the findings, you have to provide explanation in a rational way. 15. Is it okay to say 55.6% knowledge is bad and 58% practice is good? I can't see much difference % wise. 16. In conclusion, it's about college and in recommendation it's about school, so clarify your study setting in methodology section. 	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Laxmi Gautam</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Manmohan Memorial Institute of Medical Science, Tribhuvan University, Nepal</p>