

Peer Review

Review of: "Food Safety and Dietary Practices in Adult Individuals of Nadiad District"

Peter Orangi^{1,2}

1. Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan; 2. Ministry of Agriculture, Kenya, Nairobi, Kenya

This research investigates a very important societal issue and has the potential to inform policy making on areas of focus in addressing food safety. The research article is presented in a simplified manner for ease of understanding by the majority of readers. The paper is well-structured with a clear title, abstract, introduction, materials and methods, results and discussion, and conclusion. The following are my comments for further improvement.

1. Title: Food Safety and Dietary Practices in Adult Individuals of Nadiad District

Since the research is addressing food safety knowledge, this should appear in the title. Just "food safety" alone doesn't define the scope (e.g., Food Safety Knowledge or Food Safety Awareness...)

2. Abstract:

Include a sentence to show the research gap, describe the targeted population, sampling technique, and sample size. This will inform readers beforehand and ignite their interest to delve deeper into your paper.

3. Introduction

Food safety as a concept is very wide and varied. Clearly define your interest in it and narrow down to the parameters you intend to measure in your study. When you clearly define the research gap, it will help you achieve the scope of food safety in your study.

Also, clearly write a main objective of your study from which the specific objectives are derived. All your specific objectives seem to measure knowledge; please relook at them. I feel the third specific objective should be rephrased to reflect the assessment of actual practices as opposed to merely knowledge.

4. Materials and Methods.

The study area is not well described for readers to understand the target population. For example, what size of area do the 100 respondents come from? (A whole village, city?) What are the unique characteristics of these respondents apart from just handling food? What makes them a special category that makes you want to target them? In short, try to narrow down as much as possible to the specific food handlers you are targeting and how you considered the involvement of gender.

Also, mention the data collection period.

5. Results and Discussion

The use of figures and charts is well appreciated. You may, however, consider first using a table to capture the demographic statistics. That way, the reader understands what control variables are considered. You can then use the figures and charts for your discussion.

I noticed that the education level of the respondents was not captured, yet this is a key predictor of knowledge, especially in your study on food safety. Any explanation as to why this was omitted?

From your results, it shows that the majority of your respondents are government/private workers whose knowledge is assumed to be higher. Does it mean that in your study area, these are the people preparing/cooking food at the household level?

You mentioned that the respondents are people involved in preparing/cooking food at the household level, yet the majority are men. Does this present a cultural aspect of your study area? Please include this in your discussion.

For sections 3.2 to 3.13, you have used questions from your questionnaire to present the results and discussion. Some of the questions are, however, not clear on what aspect of food safety they were addressing/measuring.

For example:

3.2. What parameters define healthy foods?

3.3. Are you checking mere usage of water/soaking or use of clean water?

3.12. Couldn't it have been better to list the food items in the respective categories of whole grains, fruits, etc., and ask the respondents which ones they consume?

I suggest you first identify the key aspects you are testing from each question and explain them as your key variables in the materials and methods section.

In the results and discussion section, you can then use a table to capture the results of these variables before you discuss them. That way, readers will easily follow your logic.

6. Conclusions

You need to narrow down your conclusions to the specific target population and avoid making general inferences. You can then explain how your findings address the research gap. Also, point out the limitations of your study and recommend areas for further research.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.