



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_43306
Title of the Manuscript:	Sodium and saturated fat levels in meat products in the Netherlands: an evaluation based on label information
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	<p>1. The manuscript of Janssen et al. focuses on product reformulation and food labelling of processed meat products. Both, reformulation and food labelling, are topics currently discussed. Additionally, this food group is of high interest due to its high attributable risk regarding several NCDs. Therefore, this manuscript is of high interest to the reader.</p> <p>2 Based on the overall goal and objectives, the current title seems incomplete. The title should include as well the aim to evaluate the changes over time.</p> <p>3 Introduction, line 3-4: For reasons of completeness and with regard to the mentioned causes of NCDs, the authors are encouraged to add physical inactivity to their mentioned poor lifestyle variables</p> <p>4 In section 1.1, the authors define their 2nd objective as to determine the number of products that complied with the Choices criteria. Clearly, the period of their study covers 2011-2015, where the Choices logo could be used by manufacturers, but I was wondering why this should be of interest today since this front-of-pack label has phased out in the Netherlands?</p> <p>5 Section 2.1, 2nd paragraph: Since this manuscript focuses on processed meat products, the authors are encouraged to replace "selected product group" with "processed meat group" or comparable. This would increase clarity and legibility.</p> <p>6 Section 2.2, line 5-6: Meat preparations like fresh processed meat were not included. It would be helpful to add a statement, that these products are not part of the prepacked foods that are eligible of getting a food label and were therefore not included?</p> <p>7 Section 3.1: Only 86% of products displayed a NIP, with 3% displaying not even any nutrient information. I was at first wondering how this is compliant with EU regulations. The authors emphasize that in the first paragraph of the discussion without discussing it any further. Then they pick up this topic again in paragraph 4 on the discussion. It would be beneficial to summarize and discuss this topic in only one paragraph.</p> <p>8 Table 2: Authors are encouraged to add the total number of meat products in the table header</p> <p>9 Table 3: Table footer should be moved to the methods section since it defines the criteria that have been applied to evaluate the meat products in this manuscript. Furthermore, it would increase legibility of this table if the total number of products per category would appear in a separate column instead of in brackets behind the name of the product category.</p>	<p>2 We did not change the title, because including the 'factor time' in the title would also require to include 'how' the data was collected in the previous years (not just based on label information). This would lead to a much longer title. In our view the word 'evaluation' covers it all.</p> <p>3 Physical inactivity added</p> <p>4 The Choices criteria indicate the healthier choice within a product group. Although the programme is phased out, this remains a relevant question, since these products are high in sodium and saturated fat. We discuss this in paragraph 6 of the discussion.</p> <p>5 Replaced as suggested</p> <p>6 It was lack of time, rather than lack of availability of labels. Although not obligatory, many of these products also contain nutrition labelling information</p> <p>7 Replaced the text to first paragraph of the discussion</p> <p>8 Added to title.</p> <p>9 Extra column added with total number of products per category We have included the criteria in the methods section however, we also would like the tables to be self-explanatory, therefore we have left the short version of the criteria also in the footer of table 2.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		