

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_126707
Title of the Manuscript:	Study on Correlation Between Food Gap and Dietary Habits of Preschool Children in Nagram (Lucknow)
Type of the Article	Research

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript addresses a significant issue within public health by exploring the impact of food insecurity on the dietary habits of preschool children. It highlights the direct relationship between food access challenges and nutritional deficiencies in early childhood, a period crucial for cognitive and physical development. By focusing on a vulnerable rural population, this study emphasizes the need for targeted interventions, making it valuable for policymakers and health professionals aiming to address child nutrition disparities.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is appropriate as it clearly reflects the study's focus on food gaps and dietary habits among preschool children in a specific region. It aligns well with the paper's scope and audience.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive, offering a clear overview of the study's objectives, methodology, and key findings. However, mentioning specific statistical results or notable correlations would enhance its impact. Additionally, a brief statement on potential interventions could further highlight the study's implications.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure is logically organized, with distinct sections covering each part of the research process, from methodology to discussion. This layout facilitates a clear understanding of the study's flow and outcomes.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust, employing a cross-sectional design and quantitative analysis to assess the correlation between food insecurity and dietary habits. The use of validated food frequency questionnaires and GIS mapping adds rigor to the data collection and analysis. However, the reliance on cross-sectional data limits causal inferences, a limitation well noted by the authors.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are recent and relevant, covering key areas related to food security, child nutrition, and dietary patterns. Including more studies on food deserts and nutritional education could enrich the background further.	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Language and Grammar. The language is generally suitable but could benefit from minor grammatical revisions for readability.Suggested Additions. Adding statistical values in the abstract, as well as potential recommendations for policy improvements, would strengthen the manuscript's contribution.	
Optional/General comments	<p>The study could be enhanced by including qualitative insights, perhaps exploring parental perspectives on food access barriers.</p> <p>Based on a review of the manuscript content, there are no evident competing interest issues disclosed in the text. The authors do not appear to have a conflict that could bias the study outcomes or interpretations.</p> <p>There are no apparent ethical issues or conflicts of interest.</p> <p>The manuscript is well-structured, addresses a critical issue in public health, and provides valuable insights. While the research methodology and findings are robust, there are minor improvements suggested, particularly regarding the abstract's statistical clarity and potential additions to references. These adjustments would enhance the manuscript's clarity and impact but do not detract significantly from its overall</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ryan C. Fontanilla
Department, University & Country	Medical Colleges of Northern Philippines and International School of Asia and the Pacific, Philippines