



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_48069
Title of the Manuscript:	Physical Activity Level In Relation To the Nutrient Intake of Elite Athletes
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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>Methodology: How was the questionnaire distributed/conducted: by a researcher or paper/web version was distributed? Dietary survey: was it a part of questionnaire? If yes, 24 hour recall repeated 3 times was not possible. Was it 24 recall or 3 days food record method used. Please specify. Junk food: how was it assessed? From the 3 days intake or food intake history? Or simply by asking a question to respondents? Please explain.</p> <p>How do you calculated the energy requirements as the body parameters (e.g. weight) were not assessed? Energy requirement is highly influenced by body weight. Please, explain.</p> <p>I cannot agree that men and women food intake recommendations are the same as men have higher energy needs. In my opinion the data should be analyzed separately by sex. Please, explain. Additionally, aa examined elite athletes had different physical activity, do you think that RDA for energy and nutrients should be the same (and very high)?</p> <p>Lack information on body weight status is a very serious concern regarding the study. Why you decided not to collect these data?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Lines 27-29. Please provide some literature with the statement.	
Optional/General comments	<p>Some keywords are not relevant to the text of manuscript: e.g. ergogenic aids, fat-free mass. This issues is not examined in the study.</p> <p>It seems to me that elite athletes rather have high physical activity. Could the authors comment on the fact that in the case of a small part of the tested group of elite athletes their physical activity was assessed as sedentary?</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>There is no information on the Ethical Committee consent? This is the study with humans so it is highly recommended to have it.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Joanna Myszkowska-Ryciak
Department, University & Country	Warsaw University of Life Sciences, Poland