

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_76571
Title of the Manuscript:	Virgin Olive Oil and its Use in Croatian Gastronomic Offer
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The authors based on the results of a questionnaire from a sample from only two areas in Croatia, draw conclusions about the use of virgin olive oil in Croatia nationwide. The study is not representative of the Croatia, only a small part. The study sample should be geographically representative from all areas of Croatia or in order to be precise, the title should mention only these two areas, otherwise is misinforming. 2. I have serious concerns about the sampling magnitude, if it is adequate in order to draw conclusions. I believe that along with the magnitude of sample should be also given a percentage (approximately) based on the total number of restaurants, hotels etc. in the studied regions. Otherwise, it is meaningless (e.g. 30 chefs out of how many in total working in these two areas). Moreover, has power calculation been done to estimate the appropriate sampling magnitude, even for these two areas? 3. It is not explained how this sample was selected. 4. Also, it is not mentioned in the article, if the questionnaire, even qualitative, has been validated (e.g. face validation). 5. I have also serious concerns about the analysis and the presentation of the results. There are serious discrepancies in the presentation of the results (e.g. see percentages of question 7 and question 9, page 7). 6. Also, the presentation of the results in the question 1, is confusing. 7. In question 9, the phrase... 'at a price higher than 3 euros' ..does not refer to any unit (e.g. per litter or per Kg). 8. There are not many references for the biggest part of the article that is based on the literature. 	
Minor REVISION comments	The English is poor and there are many typing mistakes. The whole article should be revised..	
Optional/General comments	The conclusion drawn from the results of the questionnaire are biased since more that 50% of the participants are olive oil producers. This is not representative picture of the whole country or the regions.	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Zoe Mousia
Department, University & Country	Greece