



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_51008
Title of the Manuscript:	Snack consumption pattern of adults in the University of Calabar & its health implications
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/journal/30/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 topic was not fully addressed as the aspect of health implication of snack consumption was not addressed. The methodology did not show how the health implications were assessed and there was no result on the implication. Some results were not well explained. How were the Dietary Diversity Score (DDS) derived?</p> <p>There is no result showing Chi Square Statistic that was mentioned by the Author/Authors</p> <p>I do not think that observation is good enough to conclude that people are overweight</p> <p>There is need to show how intake of snacks filled the gap for those who skipped meals in order to address the topic</p>	Sorry about the mix up. I have sponged the aspects that do not belong to this paper in order to clear the confusion.
Minor REVISION comments	Some aspects introduced in the materials and methods section like medical history and lifestyle had no result shown by the author/authors	Those aspects have been removed please.
Optional/General comments	<p>The author/authors should concentrate on the aspects of the research reflected in the topic</p> <p>There should be consistency in the presentation of the references in the reference section especially in the Journal formats as some were abbreviated and others written in full</p>	Done now. Thank you

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)	