

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_84317
Title of the Manuscript:	Virgin Olive Oil: a rich source of functional bioactive compounds in the promotion of human health-An overview
Type of the Article	Minireview 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:

(<https://www.journalejns.com/index.php/EJNFS/editorial-policy>)

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>The authors start by the introduction and, after a brief methodology description, jumps straight to the discussion. The current scientific methods didn't use descriptive reviews, even for explanations about a disease. If them are exploring effects of an intervention (virgin olive oil diet), the most appropriate way is written a systematic review.</p> <p>The topics "Introduction", "fatty acids", "phenolic compounds" and all other topics can be used for a high introduction or contextualization for the theme. Then, the authors start the search mechanism and follow some recommendation to build the results, discussion and conclusion of the manuscript. These steps can improve the present review manuscript and give better results about diet for cardiovascular health.</p> <p>Abstract:</p> <p>- The abstract is very short, should be better explored, even for a part II of an review.</p> <p>Methods:</p> <p>- There are no explanations about the PROSPERO registration, search mechanism or reference recommendations to build the review. Please, register this review at: https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/ for better evaluation of the manuscript. Besides, the authors should use some recommendation for the structure of the review, checklists and search methods, like Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) (http://www.prisma-statement.org/) or Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (https://training.cochrane.org/handbook). Thus, we can avoid wrong conclusions about the issue addressed on the manuscript, as the positive effects of chromium or effects on blood glucose of diabetic people.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	No.	
Optional/General comments	No.	

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)	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alan José Barbosa Magalhães
Department, University & Country	Fundação Educacional do Município de Assis (FEMA), Brazil