

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_76666
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of interaction through child to child approach on knowledge towards junk foods among adolescents at selected private school, Kelambakkam, Kanchipuram district, Tamil Nadu, India
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 (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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Material and Method</b> This section needs to be revised and add more details               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The population included in the study was adolescents studying in <b>selected school</b>. This is the population or the sample. If the population is only students in the selected school, the result will be generalized only to that school. Give more detail about the school, e.g. the age range of th students in the school is 13-15 year old or wider than that but you pick only 13-15????</li> <li>- The study <b>excludes the adolescents who were having adequate level of knowledge regarding junk foods in pretest observation</b>. This is not in line with the finding in Table 2 as the number of students in pre-test and post-test were the same (150).</li> <li>- The sample size of the present study was 150 adolescents, calculated by using open epi formula. Considering a attrition rate of five percentage, the sample size considered for the main study was 150. <u>This is not clear. The main out come is the difference of the score of pre-test an post-test. Does the sample size sufficient to use Pair t-test? What do you use the attrition rate for?</u></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Knowledge test should be explained</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What aspects of knowledge were cover in 16 questions?</li> <li>- In the discussion, under table 1 or table 2, it would be informative if the author can point out which aspects of knowledge that majority of students got them wrong.</li> <li>- Does the intervention address the aspect of knowledge that majority of students lack of?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Detail of intervention should be explained</b> After that the <b>student trainees</b> were selected based on few criteria (<b>good language, communication skill, maintaining rapport, good voice modulation, appropriate time management</b>) to administer instructional teaching programme in the ratio of <b>1:10</b>. <u>Who select student trainee? How many criteria? (good language, communication skill, maintaining rapport, good voice modulation, appropriate time management) are example of the criteria or they are all the criteria use for selection. What is ration of 1:10? The author should explain more about the intervention, e.g. what the trainees have to do, etc.</u></li> <li>• <b>Data analysis</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cohen's d test was used to evaluate the effect size. <u>Where is the result of Cohen's d test in this paper?</u></li> <li>- In Table 2, IMPROVEMENT SCORE or mean difference should be accompanied with 95% CI. The P-value must also be provided.</li> <li>- <b>In Table 3</b>, the P-value of Chi-square test must also be provided. Recheck the percentage to make sure that it adds up to 100% (some were 100.1%, etc.). Recheck that the numbers are in the correct row. Variable 9 (source of information), information about what? Source of information is not a demographic variable.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Discussion</b> Where the discussions did not based on the finding of the study or not related to the study, they should be revised.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- (Under table 1) The reason for low score in pre test level of knowledge due to the lack of information regarding junk food consumption and its ill effects among family members and also wrong information projected through mass media. <u>No finding to support this claim.</u></li> <li>- (Under table 1) In the post test all of them had adequate knowledge. The reason might be most of the adolescents showed keen interest to learn about junk foods and also most of them were having previous experience of junk foods related health</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

**Review Form 1.6**

	<p>problems, which make the adolescents to show more interest to learn. <u>No finding to support this claim.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- (Under table 2) The reason for lack of knowledge of adolescents on junk foods might be due to lack of awareness of the students on junk foods, lack of awareness of parents on junk foods and also it is due to attractive advertisement through mass media and also tasty junk food preparation. This is the reason for inadequate knowledge of adolescents on junk foods in pre-test. <u>No finding to support this claim</u></li> <li>- (Under table 2) In the post test all of them had adequate knowledge from this result it clearly shows that the instructional teaching programme through child to child approach is more effective <b>in improving the interest, concentration and attention of the adolescents.</b> The pretest and post test were about knowledge. <u>What make the author claimed that the program improves the interest, concentration and attention of the adolescents?</u></li> <li>- there was a strong association between gender and the level of knowledge... There was a strong association between source of information and the level of knowledge. <u>These are the only two variable that P-value &lt;0.05???</u></li> <li>- (Under table 3) it shows that the adolescents who had <b>previous experience</b> on junk foods had more knowledge when compared to those who are not having <b>previous knowledge</b> on junk foods. <u>What is previous experience? Where does the author draw this conclusion from?</u></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Its Intent</b> was to boost up awareness among children regarding junk foods because it contain low nutritional value, high sugar, high calorie and high fat and it may lead to cause many life threatening ailments<sup>3,4</sup>. <u>What does its intent refer to?</u></li> <li>• In terms of unhealthy foods it has an <b>empty calorie</b> foods and have little enzyme producing vitamin, Minerals, Amino acid and contains <b>high level of calorie</b> from sugar or fat. <u>The sentence contradict itself.</u></li> <li>• inadequate knowledge (Score 1-7), moderately adequate knowledge (Score 8-12) and adequate knowledge (Score &gt;12). <u>Explain what the range of the three knowledge level is not equal.</u></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After revision of the manuscript, English gramma and typing errors must be checked.</li> <li>• Author's personal opinions should be removed. Reference in some places (sentence) were missing. For example:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It seems to have engulfed every age, every race and the newest entrance in children.</li> <li>- Teenagers are typically fond of eating junk foods, not only for its taste, but because of peer group habits.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>0 Scoring</b> <u>What is 0 scoring ?</u></li> <li>• <u>Normally N represents population, n represent sample. Please correct</u></li> <li>• <u>What is the difference between "present study" and "main study"?</u></li> </ul>	

Review Form 1.6

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>  Although it was mentioned that informed consent from studied participants and legally accepted representatives were obtained, the author should state whether the research protocol was approved by any ethic committee or give reference number of approval.	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Tipaporn Kanjanarach</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Khon Kaen University, Thailand</b>