SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

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)

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	• **Line 26: the study about snacks, are these snacks meal replacers? If not, is the comparison appropriate?** • **Lines 30-32: As you discuss healthy vs. unhealthy foods it would be appropriate to list examples. In my nutrition world we stay away from labelling foods as "unhealthy" but consider them as poorer choices. This prevents food aversions.** • **Line 43: "immunity to disease" can infer biological properties. I believe you are referring to the NCDs you refer to later. I would recommend rewording this thought.** • **Line 48-54 paragraph: non-communicable disease could mean many things. You explain them in Line 162. Defining them here would clarify your meaning.** • **You discuss the DDS in the results, but do not refer to it in the methods section. How this is calculated, or your source would be meaningful.** • **Line 180-181: Is it fair to say people were observed to be overweight? This is a judgement statement. Did you take height and weight or ask for it in the survey and calculate their BMI?** • **2.2 Data Analysis: You made comparisons with linear correlation and Chi Square, but have not shown the results of that data to medical history and only verbally with lifestyle sections. These results would be valuable to see.**	
Minor REVISION comments	• Grammar issues: line 25-more frequently than (normal?) weight; line 57- some frequently (eaten?) snacks • Biscuits vs cookies: Your context leads me to think biscuits and cookies mean the same thing (British use of term, Figure 1). Then in line 189 you use the term cookie. I find this confusing (coming from the USA) Clarifiy please. • Line 186: instead of just "pies", I recommend you say "meat pies". Again, in the USA we don't eat very many meat pies and pies to us are pastries. You will want to reach a broad audience. • Line 188: I have never thought of "burgers" as pastries.	
Optional/General comments	You thoroughness on your percentages and snack patterns was well done.	

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)*	

SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Karen Breshears***
Department, University & Country	***University of Central Missouri, USA***