

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_130514
Title of the Manuscript:	Salt Literacy and Educational Disparities in Rural Bayelsa State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

### Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The research article is overall well presented with clear research objectives that was achieved through acceptable methods and well reasoned discussions and conclusions.</p> <p>However, since the goal of a critique is to provide advice on how to enrich the reasearch article I will suggest the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The title will be more descriptive if Selected Rural Communities is used rather than Rural Communities. This is because no effort was made in sampling method to include all rural communities in Bayelsa State. The lack of a probabilty sampling method in the research has limited its generazability to rural Bayelsa and as such the title may be modified to reflect adequacy of the research work.</li> <li>2. kindly include explanation of where questionnaire is adapted from and also carefully remove any suggestive statement that the researcher formulated the questionnaire.</li> <li>3. A mention of the kind of variable literacy level is I.e categorical or quantitative and provide justification for use of t- test. One would easily assume the data to be categorical and this underscores the use of t-test.</li> <li>4. In introduction, the statement that WHO recommends less than 5g of salt should be expanded to state if this is for healthy adults or all ages and also mention those excluded in this recommendation i.e those already sick from excessive salt consumption</li> <li>5. When WHO-Shake was mentioned, the researcher stated that it focused on urban areas. Effort to explain this should be made i.e could it be because urban areas consume more processed foods.</li> <li>6. The quote of Bayelsa having low literacy level requires a source reference.</li> <li>7. Mention the number of communities selected from each senatorial district and the districts.</li> <li>8. Mention the kind of experts that reviewed the questionnaire. This will provide more clarity. The overall data collection tool validation should be expanded and more explanation on the pilot study made.</li> <li>9. On data collection, provide justification for using interviewer administered questionnaire for even the literates. Could this have been an unneedful use of resources, since the literate participants could have completed the questionnaire themselves.</li> <li>10. On result, reporting response rate would not be necessary as only willing participants was included. By design only 100% response rate was possible.</li> <li>11. Salt literacy scores for high or low should be mentioned as well as the total score.</li> <li>12. salt literacy score percentages in other studies should be mentioned and not simply low or high. Readers May desire to make the comparison themselves and understand how low is low in comparison with the index research.</li> <li>13. Mention of limitations of study(self report), as well as potential biases, and constraints in data collection will further enhance this study.</li> <li>14. Suggest possible reasons no association was found between salt literacy and educational level.</li> <li>15. Comment on the lack of significant difference in the salt literacy levels in the 3 senatorial district should be made.</li> <li>16. Other factors that may influence salt literacy like sociocultural, access to media etc can be mentioned to show that other factors besides rural living and educational level can affect salt literacy</li> <li>17. An explanation of the factors that made use of probability sampling not feasible in this study should be mentioned. A probability sampling would have made the research generalizable for rural Bayelsa community.</li> <li>18. Any plans for future expansion of the research can be mentioned or suggestion for other researches to compare rural and urban salt literacy levels in Bayelsa will show the researcher is futuristic.</li> <li>19. Although Chi square test was appropriately used, additional analysis with logistic regression would have further explored the other factors that influence salt literacy like occupation, sex etc</li> <li>20. Mention of specific ways that targeted health intervention recommendation will be implemented in the rural community I. e integrating salt literacy in community gathering, Religious institution or local media etc</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. we employed a multistage probability sampling which began from random selection from the Senatorial Districts to the Local Government Areas (LGAs), and the Rural Development Authorities (RDAs). Only rural communities in the RDAs were purposively selected based on their geographical remoteness. Thus, our results can be generalized based population-sample relationship rule, and the large sample size involved.</li> <li>2. comments on item 2 is noted and has been corrected.</li> <li>3. Salt literacy was measured on a Likert scale which yielded scores on the scale. t-test is used to compare means of different groups or the same group at Time 1 and Time 2. In our case, we used the t-test because we computed group mean scores based on senatorial districts and compared their respective means to see if any significant difference exists. Thus, our use of t-test is justifiable of not incorrect.</li> <li>4. comment 4 has been addressed</li> <li>5. The focus on urban and semi-urban areas is not because they consume more process food. Rural areas are usually given less attention regarding health initiatives in Nigeria due difficult access, cost and corrupt predominant in Nigerian politics</li> <li>6. comment 6 already has a reference.</li> <li>7. comment 7 has been addressed</li> <li>8. comment 8 has be addressed</li> <li>9. there is a reason for comment 9 already in the text</li> <li>10. comment 10 has been noted and addressed</li> <li>11. scores are reported in group means and ranges have been mentioned.</li> </ol> <p>Issues raised Items, 13 to 20 that need editing have been resolved.</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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	