

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78822
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF NUTRITIONAL STATUS AMONG MALE AND FEMALE UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS OF SAVEETHA DENTAL COLLEGE
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:

<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Abstract</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Edit to give a better summary of your research. Give more details on your results. Reduce wordiness in the introduction. Keywords ought to help the visibility of your work. Choose them carefully. <p>Introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> This whole section needs to be edited for clarity. Use paragraphs. Ensure the information flows. Reference statements made appropriately. Major research aspects ought to be reviewed here. For eg, why did you study the age you studied? All 'whys' are answered in this section. This is what justification of research entails. A good but well summarised literature review (that flows) is therefore of essence. <p>Materials and methods</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> No information was provided on the study site. Details of the population studied were not given. I wonder if ghosts were the study subjects if children and adults were excluded. Even the age of the study subjects was not provided. How sample size was arrived at was not given. This is important because published works inform the population so they need to have valid sample size calculations. Ethical considerations were not reported on. Did you get ethical approval before carrying out this research? Did you obtain consent / assent, as appropriate, as well? Sampling technique was not explained. What type of simple random sampling was done? Information on data handling was not provided. How did you actually reach your participants online? What platforms were used? <p>Results</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The results provided felt strange because most of the parameters researched on were not reviewed in the introduction. 2ndly, the details of what was actually done was not given in the materials and methods section. Results are usually introduced with a summary of the socio-demographics (age and gender) of the study population. You didn't do this but went ahead to discuss this in the discussion. This is inappropriate. <p>Discussion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> This was not properly labelled and is a gross omission. This is not another results section so no need to repeat results verbatim here. You can only discuss findings you presented in the results section. While discussing, you tactfully express your views about your research, compare with findings from previous work done (as already highlighted in the introduction abinitio) and try to explain your findings. For you to comment on weight, you need to have measured it yourself. This study was an online survey so reference to weight of the participants and inferences should not be made. 	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>6. The actual discussion attempted is too short and confusing. Kindly edit for clarity.</p> <p>7. Limitations and lines for further research come after conclusion.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>1. Edit this section for clarity.</p> <p>2. Conclude before recommending.</p> <p>3. Conclusion entails highlighting the major things this research uncovered.</p> <p>References</p> <p>1. References should follow a specific style and ought to tally with in text references.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. A grammar edit will make the write up flow better.</p> <p>2. Also, editing technical aspects like applying paragraphs, removing dead spaces, etc will add to the face value of the manuscript.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>I commend the authors for their attempt but they have not presented their manuscript properly. The methods section is too poor. This creates a lot of doubt on the quality of the research work done.</p>	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Yes. No mention of ethical approval, consent or even assent was alluded to. Though it was an online survey, how were the identity and privacy of the participants protected?</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Ofiaeli, Ogochukwu C.</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Nigeria</i>