



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_47550
Title of the Manuscript:	Screen time and physical activity pattern of school children (11-17 years) from different cultural regions of Punjab, India
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	This is a well written report on a subject of local interest and some worldwide interest as well. The results are not new and not unexpected. The paper needs some language revision. I wonder why the authors use 0,01 instead of the conventional 0,05 level for the p value in their analysis. Should be commented. Furthermore, religion and cast are not a natural parameter compared to the economic situation of the included children. For the readers some explanation is necessary. The structured questionnaire is missing and could be included in the publication.	Although results are not new, not much has been studied about physical activity pattern and screen time of school children from Punjab, especially from the perspective of regional disparity. If results are significant at 0.01, it obviously means it would be significant at 0.05, but not vice-versa. Statistician suggested to use 0.01 when results are significant at both 0.05 and 0.01, as this make results more stringent. This study was a part of my PhD research, wherein, along with other parameters, religion and caste were studied for the assessment of nutritional status. The structured questionnaire included in the publication (Appendix I).
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

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>