

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_130666
Title of the Manuscript:	Tackling Diet-related Non-Communicable Diseases in a Ghanaian population: An Assessment of Nutritional Knowledge and Cooking Practices of Fast-food Vendors in the Kumasi Metropolis of Ghana
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.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it highlights critical gaps in nutritional knowledge and cooking practices among fast-food vendors, a population with substantial influence on dietary habits and public health outcomes in Ghana. By identifying the inadequacy of nutrition knowledge and the widespread reuse of frying oil, the study provides valuable insights into potential contributors to the rising burden of diet-related non-communicable diseases (NCDs) in low- and middle-income settings. The findings emphasize the need for targeted interventions, such as nutrition education and health seminars, to improve food safety practices and mitigate NCD risks. This research contributes to the growing body of literature on the role of food vendors in shaping community health and provides a framework for policymakers to implement sustainable public health strategies.	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable as it is descriptive and aligned with the content of the study. However, it could be refined for conciseness and to improve readability. Here's a suggested alternative: Addressing Diet-related Non-Communicable Diseases in Ghana: Nutritional Knowledge and Cooking Practices of Fast-food Vendors in Kumasi	Title revised

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <p>1. Introduction:</p> <p>The statement <i>"Fast-food vendors have been identified as stakeholders responsible for meal preparation and provision to majority of people and households"</i> could be rephrased for clarity and conciseness. For example: "Fast-food vendors play a crucial role in meal preparation and provision for a significant portion of the population." The sentence <i>"However, little is known about their general knowledge on nutrition and diet-related diseases"</i> can be expanded slightly for context: "However, little is known about their nutritional knowledge and practices, particularly in relation to diet-related non-communicable diseases (NCDs)."</p> <p>2. Methods and Materials:</p> <p>Specify the <i>timeframe</i> during which the study was conducted. For example:</p> <p>"A quantitative cross-sectional study was conducted in three suburbs (Bantama, Suame, and Tafo) in Kumasi, Ghana, between [Month/Year] and [Month/Year]." Clarify the sampling method and recruitment process. For example, instead of <i>"based on chance per their location"</i>, consider:</p> <p>"Participants were randomly selected based on their location within the study areas." The description of data collection should emphasize the use of validated tools. For example: "Data were collected using a semi-structured, validated questionnaire through face-to-face interviews."</p> <p>3. Results:</p> <p>Ensure that the results are presented in a logical sequence and avoid repetition. Include a brief description of <i>key findings</i> related to the use of oils. For instance: "The study revealed that 100% of participants reused frying oil multiple times, a practice associated with increased levels of trans fats."</p> <p>4. Conclusion:</p> <p>Strengthen the conclusion by directly connecting the findings to their implications. For example: "The findings highlight a critical need for targeted nutritional education and regulation of cooking practices among fast-food vendors to reduce the risk of diet-related NCDs in Ghana."</p> <p>5. Clarity and Flow:</p> <p>Ensure consistent use of terminology. Replace <i>"nutrition knowledge"</i>, <i>"knowledge on nutrition"</i>, and <i>"knowledge adequacy"</i> with a single term (e.g., <i>"nutritional knowledge"</i>) throughout the abstract. Mention the practical implication of the chi-square findings more explicitly (e.g., gender and education level should inform targeted interventions).</p> <p>6. Wordiness:</p> <p>Eliminate phrases such as <i>"UNDER PEER REVIEW Original Research Article,"</i> as they are not part of the abstract. Rephrase <i>"participants' knowledge adequacy and inadequacy on diet-related NCDs, was 5.2% vs. 60%"</i> for better readability: "Only 5.2% of participants demonstrated adequate knowledge of diet-related NCDs, while 60% showed inadequate knowledge."</p>	<p>Revised</p> <p>Effectuated revision</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Correction made accordingly</p> <p>Noted and effected</p> <p>Revised</p>
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Thanks</p>

Review Form 3

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
---	-----	--

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>Introduction</p> <p>Flow and Transitions: The introduction feels a bit disjointed in places, jumping from one idea to another without smooth transitions. Some sentences or paragraphs could be more tightly connected to improve the flow of information.</p> <p>Clarity and Conciseness: Example: "There has been an obvious change in the lifestyle and food consumption patterns of many individuals and households in the past few years." Suggestion: "Lifestyle and food consumption patterns have significantly changed in recent years."</p> <p>Inconsistent Terminology: Example: "health-injurious ingredients such as high salt, high sugar, trans-fats, and saturated fats." This could be more formally phrased as: "nutritionally harmful ingredients, including high salt, sugar, trans fats, and saturated fats."</p> <p>Redundancy: In some parts, the same points are repeated with slightly different wording, such as when talking about the role of fast food in the diet and the health issues associated with it. Example: "Research has shown that fast foods contain health-injurious ingredients such as high salt, high sugar, trans-fats, and saturated fats." Later: "These ingredients, when in excess, lead to the development of obesity and its related DR-NCDs."</p> <p>Subjects and Methods</p> <p>Clarity and Structure: The section is clear, but some phrasing could be streamlined. For example, "sampling" could be presented more concisely, and "minimum acceptable sample size" can be simplified to just "sample size."</p> <p>Methodological Precision: The description of data collection methods, ethical considerations, and statistical analysis is appropriate. It is essential to clarify the process of sampling, especially the rationale behind the "convenience and availability" of participants in terms of their selection.</p> <p>Consistency in Terminology: Ensure consistency in terms such as “fast-food vendors” throughout the text and in the analysis of "diet-related NCDs" to maintain clarity.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>Clarity and Focus:</p> <p>The paragraph transitions are somewhat abrupt. For example, the shift from discussing gender differences in nutrition knowledge to specific nutritional practices (like MSG and fat intake) can be smoother.</p> <p>Consider organizing the points in a way that focuses on key themes—such as gender differences, nutritional knowledge gaps, specific harmful practices (e.g., MSG, oil reuse), and potential</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>health impacts.</p> <p>Language and Flow:</p> <p>Some sentences are long and complex, which might make them harder to follow. For instance, "This was to enhance the taste of the foods to draw more customers since most customers are more interested in the taste of the food than other characteristics, as asserted by empirical literature" could be simplified to "This practice aimed to enhance food taste and attract more customers, as taste is often prioritized over other characteristics, according to existing literature."</p> <p>Use active voice in some instances to make the writing more direct. For example, "More than half (60%) of the participants disagreed" could be phrased as "More than half (60%) of participants disagreed."</p> <p>Consistency in Terminology:</p> <p>Terms like "MSG" and "monosodium glutamate" are used interchangeably, but for clarity, it's better to stick to one term after introducing it once.</p> <p>The terms "fast-food vendors" and "participants" are used often but should be kept consistent when referring to the same group to avoid confusion.</p> <p>Statistical Results:</p> <p>While you provide a lot of percentages, consider explaining their significance more clearly. For example, when you mention that "66.7% disagreed that a lack of iron intake could lead to anemia," you might briefly explain why this is concerning, especially given that iron deficiency is a known cause of anemia.</p> <p>The phrase “majority of the participants” is used often, but it might be useful to clarify with exact percentages when possible to make your points more concrete.</p> <p>Logical Flow and Paragraph Structure:</p> <p>The paragraph starting with "In this study, majority of the participants rightfully disagreed..." seems to jump between topics (e.g., fats, salt intake, MSG). Consider breaking it into smaller paragraphs to maintain focus.</p> <p>Ensure each paragraph transitions smoothly from one idea to another. For example, after discussing nutritional knowledge and challenges, segue into discussing the practices like using canned tomatoes or stock cubes.</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>	