



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_36516
Title of the Manuscript:	VITAMIN D 25(OH)D DEFICIENCY SEASONALITY IN PROSTATE CANCER PATIENTS IN LATVIA
Type of the Article	Review Paper

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	1) Line 163: [Holick, 2011]. You quote it, but why do not you list it and include it in the BIBLIOGRAPHY? 2) Line 190: BMI 28.4 ± 0.25 kg/m² Line 191: 25(OH)D 17.5 ± 0.47 ng/mL The standard deviations I have marked in red do not match with the data shown in Table 1. Instead they are 4.02 and 7.46. Please check and correct them. 3) Lines 204 & 206: Which references are marked with the number (53)? 4) Line from 242 to 244: Please add any reference, at least one. 5) Line from 245 to 248: you do not provide references for the relationship between GcMAF and vitamin D. Please provide some direct reference or link it with references 17 and 18. 6) Lines from 283 to 290, from 291 to 298: Also, add references in each paragraph. 7) Line from 299 to 301: Enter this reference in the REFERENCE section. 8) Please indicate if this work presents a conflict of interest between the authors. Also, indicate the legal procedure that was followed with patients (ethical issues and appropriate ethics committee). The significance of this work is high because it is an important problem of current interest, however I would focus on the manuscript as an original article and not a review paper. Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? Yes. In this manuscript is not detailed that the study was approved by the appropriate ethics committee and has therefore been performed in accordance with the ethical standards.	I will correct this. I am check it and correct. There is no references for it. I am delete it. Dane. I am put 2 references. Done. Done. The is no conflict of interest. It a part of my Doctoral work, I have the ethical comittee resolution. No. I have the ethical comittee resolution. Where I need to write it?
Minor REVISION comments	1) The title: "<i>Vitamin D 25 (OH) D deficiency seasonality in prostate ...</i>". Why? You do not measure it by seasons. You measure the total values obtained over four years (2012-2016). Modify the title. 2) This work present out-of-date references: to old work only. Please, try to update the bibliography.	Done. I am try.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	3) Bad spellings: line 27 (yoused); line 28 (presend); line 186, line 196 & 213 (Figur); line 337 (Measurment). 4) Line 225: Estonia or England according to reference 12? 5) Line 263: "<i>The latest studies...</i>". As they are not so recent. Contribute recent bibliography.	Done. England. I am try.
Optional/General comments	1) The significance of this work is high because it is an important problem of current interest, however I would focus on the manuscript as an original article and not a review paper. 2) The manuscript has appropriate information provided. 3) The title: "<i>Vitamin D 25(OH)D deficiency ...</i>". I would change it for "25-OH-Vitamin D deficiency ..." or put in parentheses 25(OH)D: "Vitamin D [25(OH)D] deficiency..." 4) Please delete the hyphens that precede some results, for example: line 32 to 34. They look like negative values. Same in section results. 5) Lines 196 and 197: Please put in parenthesis the units: ng/mL. 6) The occurrence of a single outlier in Figure 1 could be a reason to have a p-value <0.01 and not <0.5. 7) Line 199: r is very close to 1, and is significant. It has a perfect linear relationship. The closer it is to 1, the greater the correlation; but due to the nature of the research its interpretation is considered in reverse. However, it is perfectly understood that the higher levels of PSA (or individuals that manifest it), the lower the levels of 25(OH)D. 8) Line 216-217: "... Vitamin D using Pearson's correlation was statistically insignificant (r = 0.05)". I would rather say that there is an inexistent linear correlation.	Done. Done. Done. Done. The is p<0,01 I will live: statistically insignificant (r = 0.05).