



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_42904
Title of the Manuscript:	Association of maternal macronutrient intake with urogenital infections during pregnancy
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	Title: The title of the study seems incomplete. Should include the study design, place of the work done. Introduction: should be brief and should discuss the main facts and background about the study. Material and Methods: No sample size calculation have been mentioned. Retrospective studies have a problem of Bias...what measures have been taken to reduce the recall bias. Furthermore, 7 days recall methods also adds to Bias. No inclusion and exclusion criteria's have been mentioned. Results: Application of Chi-square test in the results in inadequate... Table need to be reframed so that readers can understand them ... Discussion: quiet good. References: An original article should have 14-25 references maximum. Kindly check the no. of references are as per the journal norms	Title: We have adapted the title according to the reviewer's suggestions. Introduction: covers the important facts for the study. Materials and Methods: We included the whole population of pregnant women with nutrition assessment and vaginal/urogenital sampling. We added a sentence how we tried to reduce recall bias for 7 day recalls. Inclusion and exclusion criteria were added. Results: We adapted the results according to the correct statistical tests. Tables were reframed. References: Number of references was reduced as much as possible.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		Thank you to the reviewer for the critical remarks. We could improve the manuscript with these revisions.