

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_130399
Title of the Manuscript:	Doctor Experiences on the Use of Multivitamin and Multimineral Supplement in their Daily Practice - A Retrospective Real-World Evidence from India
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.	The subject (vitamins and minerals daily intake) is important, but the research is based on perception with no evidence whatsoever. The article has a lot of redundant information about minerals and vitamins, based on literature. The discussion section is literature based not research based, and the methodology is questionable.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title does not reflect the content of the article. Is not about the experience of the healthcare professionals in their daily practice based on material evidence, is about their perception. "The perception of healthcare professionals about the use of Supradyn multivitamins and multimineral supplement in India" could be a more suitable title.	

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>The abstract follows the article and reflects its content.</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The entire article is based on perceptions about other people's health, energy status, cause of symptoms, recovery duration, cause of diseases etc. with no supporting data (real certified diagnostics, number of patients weekly, how was the percent of women with vitamin D deficiency calculated, etc.). The methodology is poor. The instructions for the HCPs to calculate the percents of women with deficiencies from their weekly numbers of patients, the correlations between daily intake of vitamins and recovery time, assessment of the energy level of individuals, etc. are missing, and the perceptions are purely subjective.</p> <p>The article proposes the following objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gain deeper insights into how MVMS is integrated into clinical practice. 2. Identify areas of strength and potential for improvement for of MVMS based on the experience of the user. 3. Inform scientific and marketing strategies to better resonate with healthcare professionals and consumers by understanding the patient needs. 4. Enhance the scientific prospects of MVMS healthcare professional feedback and preferences along with patient requirements. <p>None of them are achieved by this research and are not described in the conclusions. The MVMS is not described in methodology (supplement content, daily intake, recommended amount, etc.).</p> <p>For a patient with Vitamin D deficiency, for example, high doses of vitamin D is more probable to be recommended and to be more efficient than a multivitamin supplement. Thus, a comparative group is necessary. The supplement recommended by all the subjects is Supradyn and the name is declared in Methodology section, so this is not about vitamins and minerals supplements, but about Supradyn multivitamins and multiminerals supplement. And this is an ethical issue.</p> <p>The methodology of this research need to be improved and a lot of data must be clarify.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are sufficient and recent. There is a reference inserted differently and need to be corrected in Introduction (" for micronutrients.²⁻⁴")</p>	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English is suitable for the most part of the article, but there are few misspelled words. (recognised, dyspnea, etc.)</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This looks like an advertising for a certain type of supplement, rather than a scientifically conducted research. Please correct the methodology.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Petre Lacramioara</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>"Francisc I. Rainer" Institute of Anthropology, Romania</p>