

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_128770
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigation of The Effect of Gender on Ready-to-Eat Food Consumption Status of Associate Degree Students
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: 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 paper offers insightful information about how university students' consumption of ready-to-eat food varies by gender. It draws attention to the necessity of more wholesome food options and focused public health initiatives. The results can help the food industry and future studies address students' dietary habits and encourage improved nutrition. This manuscript appears solid, but there is still room for improvement. Please revisit your work based on my suggestions, which are provided in the tracked changes within your Word file.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	You should revisit your title. I suggest the title " Effects of Gender Difference on Fast Food Consumption among Associate Degree Students"	
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.	I appreciate your abstract. You have incorporated adheres to the journal's author guidelines.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears scientifically correct, but a thorough review of data analysis and interpretations is recommended for full accuracy.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references seem sufficient, but adding recent studies (up to 5 years back only) could enhance the manuscript.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language quality is generally suitable for scholarly communication; however, there is still room for improvement. Slight enhancements in clarity and structure could significantly improve readability.	
Optional/General comments	a) I believe your introduction is well-stated, but there is room for improvement. Provide a factual background, clearly define the problem, and explain its significance for the research. Additionally, present relevant literature, identify any research gaps, and clarify why gender is an important variable in this context. b) You have Well-detailed methodology, but consider elaborating on the sampling procedure and ethical considerations for voluntary participation.	

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:	Bhagawoti Sharma
Department, University & Country	Mahendra Multiple Campus Nepalgunj, Tribhuvan University, Nepal