

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_110367
Title of the Manuscript:	FOOD LITERACY: A MATTER OF CONCERN AMONG FEMALE UNIVERSITY STAFF
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<p>The subject is in a current and important area. However, I think its contribution to the literature is limited. It is known that data obtained from a university cannot be expected to represent the whole society or other universities.</p> <p>The title of the article is not compatible with its content.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>-They should explain in the method how they divided food literacy knowledge into dichotomies in logistic regression. -Need to explain RC footnote of tables. -The findings are mixed and difficult to understand, and there are discrepancies in statistical evaluations. -While there was a significant difference between men and women for food literacy in the logistic regression, the insignificant difference in the chi-square test should be explained. -The discussion is insufficient, literature information is lacking, a better literature review on the subject is required</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Hasan Durmus
Department, University & Country	Erciyes University, Türkiye