

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_128460
Title of the Manuscript:	Identification and Life Style Assessment of Vegan Population in Chandigarh Tricity: A Detailed Survey
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The manuscript addresses the growing global interest in plant-based diets by focusing on the vegan population in the Chandigarh Tricity area, a relatively underexplored region in this context. By examining factors such as motivations, challenges, and dietary practices, it has the potential to provide insights into localized perceptions of veganism, which could inform future interventions promoting sustainable dietary habits. However, due to its methodological weaknesses, particularly the small sample size and insufficient representation of vegans, the study's contribution to the scientific community is limited. With significant improvements, the research could add value by offering region-specific data to the broader discourse on plant-based diets and sustainability.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The phrase "A Detailed Survey" may be misleading, given the methodological shortcomings and the disproportionately small sample size of (15) vegan respondents, which limit the depth and breadth of the findings. <i>Vegan Lifestyles in Chandigarh Tricity: Insights from a Limited Cross-Sectional Survey</i>	
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.	The abstract is not comprehensive and lacks essential details about the methodology and key findings. It does not mention the small sample size of vegan respondents, which significantly impacts the study's generalizability. Additionally, the abstract should include specific data points, such as the proportion of vegans and the primary challenges identified, to provide a clearer summary of the results. I recommend adding these details and briefly acknowledging the methodological limitations to ensure a balanced and accurate representation of the study.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript contains several scientific inaccuracies and methodological shortcomings that undermine its credibility. The disproportionately small sample size of vegan respondents (15 out of 250) is not representative and invalidates many of the conclusions drawn about the vegan population in the Chandigarh Tricity area. Additionally, the lack of justification for the sample size or description of the survey's validation process raises concerns about the reliability of the data collection. The absence of rigorous statistical analyses and insufficient integration of the findings with existing literature further detract from its scientific accuracy. Therefore, the manuscript cannot be considered scientifically robust in its current form.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references in the manuscript are somewhat sufficient but lack recent sources. While some key studies are cited, many references are older, with some going back several decades. For example, references to veganism's historical context and early advocates may not be as relevant to the current research focus, which could benefit from more recent studies on veganism, particularly in the context of the specific region being studied. To improve the manuscript, the authors should include more recent studies.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The authors should revise the manuscript for grammatical accuracy, improve sentence flow, and ensure consistency in terminology and style.	
Optional/General comments	<p>While the study addresses a relevant and timely topic, it fails to meet the necessary methodological and analytical standards, ultimately diminishing its potential contribution to the field.</p> <p>The primary limitation lies in the sampling size and representation. The authors report a total survey population of only 250 respondents, which is insufficient for a study claiming to provide a comprehensive assessment of vegan lifestyles in a region as diverse as Chandigarh Tricity. This limitation is further compounded by the fact that only 15 participants self-identified as vegans, resulting in a subsample that is far too small to yield reliable or generalizable insights about vegan practices and attitudes. Such an imbalance between the study's aims and its actual dataset fundamentally weakens the validity of its conclusions. Additionally, the manuscript fails to provide any justification for the choice of 250 participants as the total sample size or to employ scientific methods to determine the adequacy of this figure for meaningful statistical analysis. The absence of a clear rationale or methodological rigor in defining the sample size and its composition significantly undermines the credibility of the study and calls into question the robustness of its findings.</p> <p>The ambiguity surrounding the survey design further compounds these issues. Although the authors mention that a systematic questionnaire was used, the manuscript provides insufficient details about its development, validation, and content. This lack of transparency raises significant concerns about the reliability of the data collection process. Additionally, while the manuscript briefly mentions the use of focus group discussions to enrich the findings, it fails to present any qualitative analysis or substantive insights derived from these discussions. The absence of methodological rigor in the design and application of the survey undermines the study's findings and limits their relevance.</p> <p>Another significant shortfall is the manuscript's inability to focus adequately on its stated objectives. A substantial portion of the text is devoted to general background information about veganism, much of which is tangential to the specific aims of the study. For example, detailed descriptions of vegan types and historical perspectives on veganism occupy valuable space that could have been better utilized to analyze or contextualize the findings. The results themselves are presented in a fragmented manner, and the discussion does not link them cohesively to broader theoretical frameworks or existing literature. As a result, the manuscript lacks depth and fails to offer meaningful contributions.</p> <p>In its current form, the manuscript suffers from critical methodological and structural flaws that render it unsuitable for publication. The authors need to address these substantial issues by expanding the sample size, improving the transparency and rigor of the survey design, and ensuring a focused and analytically robust discussion that aligns with the study's objectives. Until these shortcomings are resolved, the findings cannot be considered reliable or impactful.</p> <p>The authors do not state whether they obtained ethical approval for the study or how informed consent was handled, which is essential for studies involving human participants.</p>	

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:	Ahmet Murat Günal
Department, University & Country	Haliç University, Türkiye