



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_43782
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Nutrition Knowledge Among University Students in Ankara
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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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>It is a new area to be explored more and thus study is important. However, manuscript needs to be modified:</p> <p>Lines 27 to 29: why did the authors include references 10-13, what is the relationship with the study?</p> <p>How the volunteer students were invited and included in the study?</p> <p>For better analysis, the results of table 1 should be better shown, present the true and false answers in numbers and percentages.</p> <p>Very long paragraph (lines 82-106), it must be separated.</p> <p>Add the access link of the references 1,14,15,20,21,22.</p> <p>The true or false answers of the university students do not guarantee that they consume the food. Studies on food knowledge and its health benefits can be complemented with the food consumption habits of the respondents. Could this aspect be limiting in the study discussions?</p> <p>Was it possible to verify the course in which participants study? the degree of complexity of the questions may have compromised the answers?</p> <p>Abstract and item 4, the conclusion of study you should write the more clearly the main results according to the purpose of the study.</p> <p>Consent:</p> <p>The study was conducted with people, so it requires ethical analysis by ethics committee. The authors declared that experiments have been examined and approved by the appropriate ethics committee and have therefore been performed in accordance with the ethical standards laid down in the 1964 Declaration of Helsinki. Was obtained written informed consent from the participants for publication of this study.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>To include strengths and limitations of the study</p> <p>Is it possible to consider the correct and incorrect answers by adopting a cut rating for low, moderate and high percentages and mean nutritional scores?</p>	
Optional/General comments	For better understanding, results and discussion should be described separately.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marize Melo dos Santos
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Piaui, Brazil