



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_50547
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comparative Study on The Diet Quality of Pregnant Women in Urban and Rural Settings in A South-Western District of Bangladesh
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>)



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>Abstract Correct grammar in abstract (missing prepositions). E.g. "62% of urban..." and not "62% urban...". There are also missing determiners in front of some words. E.g. "A significant difference" a medium-quality", "the majority"</p> <p>Introduction Check sentence structure in line 31-32. Also, insert a hyphen in "medium quality", "high quality"</p> <p>Correct the use of noun (residence) instead of adjective in line 46.</p> <p>Methods Check the period of study in line 52-53. The dates are wrong. Delete "about" in line 56. The actual number of participants is known. Revise sentence in line 58-59</p> <p>Discussion Check line 137</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Methods A simple random sampling method was used to select a total sample of 154: 77 per residential area (urban/rural). However, 4 areas have also been mentioned. Could you provide more information on which of these areas was rural or urban and how the sample was collected from these areas to ensure representativeness? What was the level of statistical significance in this study? It is assumed to be 5% but that is not always the case since it varies between studies.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The manuscript is sound but it needs copyediting: so many missing prepositions and determiners especially in the first paragraph of the results section.</p> <p>What was the diet recall period?</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, there are ethical issues in this manuscript. The study involved human subjects for that matter, approval is needed from a review board. Besides, nowhere in the manuscript has the ethical considerations followed in this study been mentioned.</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Michael Boah</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Harbin Medical University, China</i>