

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_71091
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring the Factors affecting Organic Food Purchase as Immunity Booster during the Pandemic
Type of the 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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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 title of the paper is Exploring the Factors affecting Organic Food Purchase as Immunity Booster during the Pandemic however, the paper does not show that any factors influencing the purchase of organic food were examined for its use as an immunity booster during a pandemic.</p> <p>RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</p> <p>It seems that either the metdology should be clarified or the literature should be provided.</p> <p>For example:</p> <p>DOI: https://doi.org/10.7275/jyj1-4868</p> <p>Brett Williams Journal of Emergency Primary Health Care (JEPHC), Vol.8, Issue 3, 2010 -Article 990399</p> <p>SAMPLE SELECTION AND QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTRATION</p> <p>Very sparsely described research methodology. No information about sample selection, how questionnaires were distributed and how answers were obtained - information that they were filled off and online is too concise.</p> <p>Was this research anonymous?</p> <p>There is a lack of description of the questionnaire. The paper says that 37 questions related to the topic were used but nowhere is it explained what the respondents were asked about or what response scale was used in the questionnaire. Similarly for the others.</p> <p>There is also no description of the measurement model or diagram.</p> <p>DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS & DISCUSSION:</p> <p>How was awareness of organic food assessed? What did these two questions contain? Please describe this in more detail.</p> <p>On what basis was it concluded that the demographic variable has no influence on purchase intention?</p> <p>This raises 2 questions: firstly how was this assessed, secondly there were no respondents with a low level of education which may translate into low earnings.</p> <p>It seems that this conclusion is either too hasty or applies to this particular group of respondents. This is where background would be useful.</p> <p><u>Objective 3: To explore and validate the dimensions of organic food purchase.</u></p> <p>ANALYSIS AND RESULTS:</p> <p>There needs to be some explanation of what this study was about - but that should be in the methodology. Here, however, no data are presented on the basis of which these results were obtained.</p> <p>Factor Extraction and Total Variance Explained:</p> <p>What factors were assessed here? Apart from explaining how the analysis was carried out, nothing is known about what was studied</p> <p>Predicted Model</p> <p>How was this model created? No description</p> <p>At least a brief discussion of the results is missing</p> <p>CONCLUSION:</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>The conclusion should be elaborated on the results obtained. They should be clearly specified.</p> <p>References:</p> <p>Organise literature according to journal requirements</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>LITERATURE REVIEW:</p> <p>It would be better to organize the factors influencing the choice of organic food by importance of influence rather than by author. Some disorder arises here. It is not always clear for whom AND why this factor is decisive. The context should therefore also be expanded.</p> <p>DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS & DISCUSSION:</p> <p>Table 1 : Demographic Analysis This implies that all respondents had at least a secondary education? I repeat the question - how was the research group collected? This should be stated in the research methodology. Specify the unit</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The topic of the paper is very interesting, but the paper itself needs tidying up, clarifying and correcting. First of all, there is a need for a more detailed discussion of the research methodology and the inclusion of research results because it is not entirely clear what has been assessed and how. This raises considerable doubts about the conclusions. At least a small discussion of the results is also missing. The subject does not fully reflect the content of the work. Conclusions require clarification.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Izabela A. Boleslawska
Department, University & Country	Poznan University of Medical Sciences, Poland