



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_38880
Title of the Manuscript:	Diet of Benghazi Cancer Patients; Quality and Associated factors
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This manuscript presents great relevance. The methodology needs to be better described. • The use of the Healthy Eating Index should be described, not just mentioned. • Recall 24 hours: Was food consumption collected on three consecutive days? Were any of those days a weekend? Describe this information. • What criterion was used to define eating out of home? • To describe methodologically how was done the classification of quality of the diet. • In the section "statistical analysis, verify if the t-test was used properly (to verify differences between averages). Describe the Analysis of variance by ANOVA in the methodology. The results are clear, but the writing of the results can be improved. Tables need to have a description of symbols and acronyms. It is recommended that the authors verify the existence of current papers for discussion. In the discussion are used references that do not mention the population studied in the present study, making it difficult to compare the data. There are newer articles with oncology patients that can be cited.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In the section "statistical analysis", there is the existence of a sentence in repetition. There are acronyms not written extensively in the manuscript.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The introduction and conclusion of the paper are well written. The methodology and results require improvements to better understand the reader and to enable replication of the study.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Suelyne Rodrigues de Morais
Department, University & Country	Master's Degree in Nutrition and Health, Ceara State University, Brasil