

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80486
Title of the Manuscript:	Consumers' level of awareness and safety perceptions of food additives
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)

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>The article "Consumers' level of awareness and safety perceptions of food additives" is an interesting work based on a questionnaire to consumers' perceptions on food additives.</p> <p>The topic is interesting, the work was well conducted and the number of respondents is robust. I found the article still "raw". The presentation of results is mostly the repetition of the results in the tables. It could be simplified.</p> <p>I understand that several publications used this model of tables with "n" and "%". I do not agree with that, particularly when the n is constant. It brings more noise than information. The tables are, in my opinion, excessively long and could be reduced if the authors present only the percentage (that is what is discussed)</p> <p>The statistical procedures are not clearly explained. There are p-values in the results that it is not clear from where they came. There is a note in the abstract on that, but it should be clearly explained at the end of the MM section.</p> <p>I made several (a lot of) comments on the manuscript.</p> <p>In my opinion, the article can be published, but a major revision is necessary in order to consider to accept it.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Luis Patarata
Department, University & Country	University Of Trás-Os-Montes And Alto Douro, Portugal