

Manuscript: “**The Short-Term Effects of COVID-19 Pandemic Lockdown on Eating Habits and Dietary Changes Case of Tirana, Albania**”

Submitted: 23 December 2020

Accepted: 19 March 2021

Published: 31 May 2021

Corresponding Author: Pranvera Troka

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n17p30

Peer review:

Reviewer 1:Blinded

Reviewer 2: Dr. Rajasekhar Kali Venkata, Ph.D, University of Hyderabad, India

Reviewer 3: Dr. Ma'moun A. Habiballah, \Al-Hussein Bin Talal University, Jordan

Reviewer 4: Ammar B. Altemimi, University of Basrah, Iraq

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision. ***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name: Dr. Rajasekhar Kali Venkata, Ph.D	Email:
University/Country: University of Hyderabad, India	
Date Manuscript Received: 17 th February, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 18 th February, 2021
Manuscript Title: The Assessment of eating habits and dietary changes during Covid-19 pandemic lockdown: case study of Tirana	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0119/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No YES	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<i>No special comments are necessary</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	4

results.	
<i>The abstract is meaningfully written and crisp too</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Except a spell check with one single word repeatedly, no special mention is necessary in this regard.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>Simple study method and the same was presented properly</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Subjective analysis could have been a better guiding tool in explaining the results, however the chosen method of descriptive analysis too was effective.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusions were in line with the study chosen</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Need to present few more references in support of certain scientific premises explained in the article.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	YES
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

No special suggestions are essential to the authors.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr. Ma'moun A. Habiballah	
University/Country: Al-Hussein Bin Talal University/ Jordan	
Date Manuscript Received: 20/2/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 26/3/2021
Manuscript Title: The assessment of eating habits and dietary changes during Covid -19 pandemic lockdown ”: Case study of Tirana	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0119/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3

Nothing was mentioned about data collection method, and the data analysis techniques used in this study	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Critical reading is needed to improve paper's language (look for example lines 108-110 & 133-134). 2. Most of the introduction was written in sentences. It should be rewritten in coherent paragraphs. 3. No need to use the italic typing style for lines 91-92. 	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the scientific resources used to build the questionnaire? 2. Nothing was mentioned about the format of the questionnaire. 	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Age groups were distributed incorrectly; for example the 2nd group should start from 21 years while the 3rd group should start from 41 years... etc. 2. Groups of education characteristic are not clear; for example, what does the middle level of education stands for? 3. Table of food categories doesn't show consumers who reduced their consumption during the quarantine. 4. Who said that Albanians used to buy their dairy products from farmer? (cite please). Also what does this have to do with their level of consumption during the quarantine? Many similar facts were not cited & were not also connected to study's data properly. 	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Most of the conclusion is a summary for the results no more !! 2. There is no real discussion or justification or comparison with previous studies 3. Implications were general look like an advice (e.g. line 203). 	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
A critical reading is needed to rewrite some references in a consistent and proper way following the APA system.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

1. Wikipedia is not accepted as a reference for a scientific paper, replace it with more credible citation.
2. The 2nd sentence (lines 44-46) has no citation !!
3. Sentence in lines 51-53 has no citation !!
4. More details are needed to be mentioned about some studies (e.g. Eftimov (2020)), these details include study's context population and sample ... etc.
5. The reference of (Eftimov, 2020) was overused.
6. Some citations need to be rewritten properly (example in line 85).
7. No citations for the facts mentioned in lines 87-90.
8. Nothing was mentioned about the research gap which this research tried to bridge.
9. Instead of explaining heavily the origin & meaning of the word "quarantine" researchers can demonstrate the variation of quarantines around the globe, its importance & its non-nutritional effects.