



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013 IJTDH 4035
Title of the Manuscript:	Body Ailments Dietary Pattern and Nutritional Status of Elderly in Ondo State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Research paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	There are several major problems with the manuscript as presented: 1) Sample number – While the population based sampling procedure is adequately described, indicating a sample size of 400. The abstract indicates a random sampling of 400 – yet data for only 230 individuals (120 men; 110 women) is presented. If additional people were sampled, why was their data not included. 2) Prevalence data (Table 1) – There is a lengthy description of differences in prevalence of the various conditions between men and women – but the overall prevalence of some of the conditions is small (i.e. <3% diabetes). Further, statistical tests (chi-square) are needed to make the comparisons meaningful. 3) BMI associations – while the finding of higher prevalence of hypertension and asthma in the obese is interesting, the total number of obese individuals is not given (only mentions 22% overweight/obese). Is the number of obese sufficient to allow meaningful analysis? Also, as a cross-sectional study, the results do not provide information on the temporal associations between obesity and disease conditions (cannot assume that the asthma develops as a result of obesity) 4) The dietary pattern information is not clearly presented. For instance, the means for	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	determination of 'dietary factor scores' is not described. Further, although the dietary factor scores are presented as quartiles in Tables 3a and 3b – many of the values are negative numbers. How were they derived?	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	English grammar and usage needs to be checked throughout the manuscript.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer